

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CCXV.]

NOVEMBER, 1862.

[Vol. XVIII.]

PURITAN LIFE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY: A SKETCH OF
PHILIP HENRY, IN HIS DOMESTIC, MINISTERIAL AND ECCLE-
SIASTICAL RELATIONS:

BEING ONE OF THE COURSE OF LECTURES RECENTLY DELIVERED IN LONDON.

BY REV. CHARLES WICKSTEED, B.A.,
A LINEAL DESCENDANT OF PHILIP HENRY.

I HAVE thought that amidst the exposition of the general principles involved in, and the general results ensuing from, the great Nonconformist struggle and separation of the 17th century, likely to engage the attention of so many people during the present year, an outline of the actual life of a man living in those times, and the concrete form in which the abstract would thus be brought before the mind, might not be useless or unacceptable as a contribution to the Bicentenary memorials of the year; and I have therefore with all plainness put together what I conceive to be the most characteristic facts and features in the life and fortunes of one in whom, from the circumstance of kindred, I have all my life felt a reverential interest, and who, though not distinguished by the greatness of his talents or the importance of his public position, has left behind him a character that has taken firm hold of and struck deep root in the heart of the English people, as is testified by the continued republications for a hundred and fifty years of his son's Biography of him, by its introduction by Dr. Wordsworth in the earlier editions of his Ecclesiastical Biography, and by the laborious compilation of all attainable memorials of him by the late Sir John Bickerton Williams.

A Welsh boy, John Henry, born in the year 1590, at Britton Ferry, at the mouth of the river Neath, in Glamorganshire, leaving behind him the quiet beauty of Swansea Bay, started, with a groat in his pocket, for London. Here he entered the service of the Earl of Pembroke, who afterwards becoming Lord Chamberlain, made him Keeper of the Royal Pleasure-grounds at Whitehall, where, as his son Philip afterwards wrote, he lived plentifully and in good repute, but laid by nothing. Subsequently he was made Page of the Back-stairs to the King's second son (afterwards James II.), which place obliged him to a

personal attendance upon the Duke in his chamber. Need we wonder, then, that we also learn from his son that "he lived and died a courtier and a hearty mourner for his Royal Master, King Charles the First, whom he did not long survive? He continued, during all the war time, in his house at Whitehall, though the profits of his places ceased." When the King was going, in the quietly indignant words of Philip Henry, "to that which they *called* his trial," he took barge for Westminster at Garden-stairs, and, passing by the door, inquired for his old servant, Mr. John Henry, who being ready to pay his due respects to him, the King said, "Art thou *alive* yet?" when Henry courageously praying that God would bless his Majesty and deliver him out of the hands of his enemies, "the guard had like to have been rough upon him."

This was the father of Philip Henry, and this was the mother:

"She was a virtuous and pious gentlewoman, altogether dead to the vanities and pleasures of the Court, though she lived in the midst of them. She looked well to the ways of her household, prayed with them daily, catechized her children, and taught them the good knowledge of the Lord betimes." There appearing in her only son Philip early inclinations both to learning and piety, she devoted him in his tender years to the service of God in the work of the ministry. "My head," said she, a little before she died, "my head is in heaven and my heart is in heaven; it is but one step more and I shall be there too."

Philip Henry was the only son of this worthy couple. He was born at Whitehall, by an extraordinary coincidence, which in subsequent years was never absent from his memory, on the 24th of August, 1631, being St. Bartholomew's-day. His susceptors in baptism were Philip, Earl of Pembroke (who gave him his name and was kind to him as long as he lived, as was also his son Philip after him), James, Earl of Carlisle, and the Countess of Salisbury. Prince Charles and the Duke of York being somewhat near of an age to him, he was in his childhood very much an attendant on them in their play, and they were often with him at his father's house, and they were wont to tell him what preferment he should have at Court as soon as he was fit for it. He kept a book to his dying day which the Duke of York gave him, "and I have heard him," adds his son Matthew, "bemoan the loss of two curious pictures which he gave him likewise." Archbishop Laud took a particular kindness to him when he was a child, because he would be very officious to attend at the water-gate (which was part of his father's charge in Whitehall) to let the Archbishop through, when he came late from council to cross the water to Lambeth; and when the Archbishop was a prisoner in the Tower, his father took him with him to see him, and he would remember that the Archbishop gave him some new money.

“The breaking up and scattering of the Court in 1641, when he was ten years old, as it dashed the expectation of his Court preferments, so it saved him from the danger of Court entanglements; and though it was not a choice of his own, as with Moses, when come to years to quit the Court, yet when he was come to years, he always expressed a great satisfaction in his removal from it, and blessed God, who chose his inheritance so much better for him.”

The first Latin school he went to was at St. Martin’s church, under the teaching of Mr. Bonner, “who was very loving,” he says, “to me, and took pains with me.” Afterwards he was removed to Battersea, “where,” he says, “I tabled at one Mr. Heyborn’s by the water-side, and went to school to one Mr. Wells.” But in the year 1643, when he was about twelve years old, he was admitted into Westminster school, in the fourth form, under Mr. Thomas Vincent, then usher, whom he would often speak of as a most able, diligent schoolmaster; and one who grieved so much at the dulness and non-proficiency of any of his scholars, that, falling into a consumption, Philip Henry would say, he even killed himself with false Latin. A while after, he was taken into the upper school, under the celebrated Dr. Busby, for fifty-eight years Master of Westminster school; and in October, 1645, he was admitted King’s scholar, and was first of the election, partly by his own merit, and partly by the interest of his godfather, the Earl of Pembroke.

Here at Westminster school he spent some of the happiest years of his life. “Dr. Busby took a particular kindness to him, called him his child, and would sometimes tell him he should be his heir.” Dr. Busby is known to posterity, not only for his learning, but (less enviably) for his severity. But his pupil, Philip Henry, would say sometimes, that as in so great a school there was need of a strict discipline, so, for his own part, of the four years he was in the school, he never felt the weight of his hand but once, “and then,” said he, “I deserved it.” For being monitor of the chamber, and being sent out to seek a truant, he was persuaded to make an excuse for him and say that he could not find him. The next day, the truant coming under examination, and being asked whether he saw the monitor, said “Yes, he did,” at which Dr. Busby was much surprised, and turning his eye upon young Henry, said, “*καὶ σὺ τέκνον,*” gave him correction, and appointed him to make a penitential copy of Latin verses, which when he brought he gave him sixpence, and received him into his favour again.

Ireland, the editor of Hogarth’s works, being introduced as a descendant of Philip Henry to Dr. Johnson, he said to him in his high style, “Sir, you are descended from a man whose genuine simplicity and unaffected piety would have done honour to any sect of Christians; and as a scholar he must have had

uncommon acquirements, when *Busby* boasted of having been his tutor."

I give the following incident for the sake of the illustration it affords both of the customs of Westminster school at the time, and of the mode in which Henry thought and spoke of it. "Among the mercies of God to him in his youth (and he would say, it were well if parents would keep an account of those for their children, till they came to be capable of doing it for themselves, and then to set them upon the doing of it) he has recorded, that it was customary among the studious boys for one or two or more to sit up the former part of the night at study; and when they went to bed, about midnight, to call others, and they others at two or three o'clock as they desired. His request was to be called at twelve; being awaked, he desired his candle might be lighted, which was fastened to the head of the bed. He dropt asleep again; the candle fell and burnt part of the bed; but through God's good providence, seasonable help coming in, the fire was soon quenched and he received no harm. This gave him occasion long after to say, 'It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed.'" While at Westminster, he was employed, with others of the more clever and industrious scholars, to collect, in their reading of Greek authors, some materials for Dr. *Busby's* Greek Grammar, soon afterwards published.

Being now in his sixteenth year, the time approached for his departure for Oxford. "It was the ancient custom of Westminster school that all the King's scholars who stood candidates for an election to the university, were to receive the Lord's Supper the Easter before, which he did with the rest in St. Margaret's church, in Easter, 1647; and he would often speak of the great pains which Dr. *Busby* took with his scholars which were to approach to that solemn ordinance for several weeks before, at stated times; with what skill and seriousness of application and manifest concern for their souls, he opened to them the nature of the ordinance and of the work they had to do in it, and instructed them what was to be done in preparation for it; and this he made a business of, appointing them their religious exercises instead of their school exercises."

The effect of this religious care on the part of the stern old scholar on young Henry, he thus himself records: "There had been treaties before between my soul and Jesus Christ, with some weak overtures towards him; but then, then I think it was, that the match was made, the knot was tied; then I set myself in the strength of divine grace about the great work of self-examination, in order to repentance, and then I repented; that is, solemnly and seriously, with some poor meltings of soul. I confessed my sins before God, original and actual, judging and condemning myself for them, and casting away from me all my transgressions, receiving Christ Jesus the Lord as the Lord my

Righteousness, and devoting and dedicating my whole self, absolutely and unreservedly, to his fear and service. After which, coming to the ordinance, there, there I received him indeed; and he became mine; I say mine. Bless the Lord, O my soul!"

In allusion to the influence of this serious examination and devotion of himself to Christ and his service in all honesty and fidelity on his after life, he tells us, that the first time he, a grave divine of thirty, waited on Dr. Busby, after he was turned out by the Act of Uniformity, the Doctor said, "And prythee, child, what made thee a Nonconformist?" when Henry replied, "Truly, Sir, you made me one, for you taught me those things which hindered me from conforming." He was induced by this personal experience of his own "to take like pains," he says, "with others, at their first admission to the Lord's table, and have, through grace, seen the comfortable fruits of it, both in mine own children and others."

In addition to all his school-work, he attended, by the special desire of his mother and the permission of the doctor (who did not abate anything of his school exercises on that account, only dispensing with his attendance that hour), the morning lecture at the Abbey, between six and eight o'clock. Every Thursday, he attended, with his mother, Mr. Case's lecture at St. Martin's. On the Sunday of course there were services to be attended, and he always spoke with especial gratitude of those of Mr. Stephen Marshall, at New chapel, a man of whom Baxter used to say, "If all Presbyterians had been like Mr. Stephen Marshall, and all the Independents like Mr. Jeremiah Burroughs, and all Episcopalians like Archbishop Usher, the breaches of the Church would soon have been healed." He also attended constantly on the monthly fasts at St. Margaret's, where the best and ablest ministers of England preached before the then House of Commons, and the service of the day was carried on with great strictness and solemnity from eight in the morning till four in the evening.

Besides these, he frequented extraordinary fasts and thanksgivings. He used to sit upon the pulpit-stairs at St. Margaret's, and it was his constant practice, from eleven or twelve years old, to take down, as best he could, all the sermons that he heard, "and many of them to write out fair again." I confess it is not without a sense of respectful and admiring compassion that I hear him say in after life, "If ever any child, such as I then was, between the tenth and fifteenth year of my age, enjoyed line upon line, precept upon precept, I did." But, he adds, "My soul rejoiceth and is glad at the remembrance of it; the word distilled as the dew and dropped as the rain. I loved it, and loved the messengers of it; their very feet were beautiful to me. And, Lord, what a mercy it was that, at a time when the

poor countries were laid waste, when the noise of drums and trumpets and the clattering of arms was heard there, and the ways to Sion mourned, that then my lot should be where there was peace and quietness, where the voice of the turtle was heard, and there was great plenty of gospel opportunities! Bless the Lord, oh my soul! as long as I live I will bless the Lord. I will praise my God while I have my being. Had it been only the restraint that it laid upon me, whereby I was kept from the common sins of other children and youths (such as cursing, swearing, sabbath-breaking and the like), I were bound to be very thankful. But that it prevailed through grace effectually to bring me to God, how much am I indebted! and what shall I render?"

These personal experiences made him say of and to young people, "I tell you, you cannot begin to be religious too soon, but you *may* put it off *too long*. The life of the Christian is a life of labour, and its command is, 'Son, go work.'" And to those who laid so much stress on people knowing the exact time of their conversion, which he thought was with many not possible to do, he would argue from the same experiences, "Who can so soon be aware of the daybreak, or of the springing up of the seed sown?" and he would bid them remember the blind man, who, when the Pharisees were so critical in examining him on the mode of the recovery of his sight, said, "That, this and the other, I know not concerning it; but this one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see." The work of grace, he would say, is better known in its effects than in its causes.

On Dec. 15, 1647, in his seventeenth year, he removed to Oxford. He was but a young traveller, and with his usual thankfulness he records how there may be a great mercy in a small matter, "as the care that was taken of me by strangers, when I fainted and was sick in my inn the first night, and my casual meeting with Mr. Annesley, son to the Viscount Valentia (who was chosen from Westminster School at the same time with himself), when my other company, going another way, had left me alone, and utterly at a loss what to do." Arrived at Oxford, he was entered a commoner of Christ Church. His godfather, the Earl of Pembroke, who had promoted his election from Westminster, gave him £10 to buy him a gown, pay his fees and set out with,—a seasonable mercy, he records, in regard of some straits which Providence, by the calamity of the times, had brought his father to. On March 24, 1648, the next year, he was admitted student of Christ Church by Dr. Henry Hammond, who called him his godbrother, Prince Henry having given him his name, and the Earl of Pembroke having been godfather to them both.

The very next month, the visitation of the university by Parliament took place, and the Earl of Pembroke and several other

Commissioners came down, and the sole question, Philip Henry says, which the visitors proposed to each person, high and low, in every college that had any place of profit, was this: "Will you submit to the power of the Parliament in this present visitation?" to which all were to give in their answer in writing, and accordingly were either displaced or continued. Some cheerfully complied, others absolutely refused; among whom he would sometimes tell of one that was but of his standing, who gave in this bold answer: "I neither can nor will submit to the power of the Parliament in this present visitation; I say I cannot, I say I will not." Others answered doubtfully, pleading youth and ignorance in such matters.

As for himself, he shewed at this early age exactly that characteristic which I find stamped upon all his conduct through life, and that was a great indisposition to pronounce utterly and positively on the absolute and unqualified rightfulness of one view of public questions, and the absolute and unmitigated erroneousness of the other, and a tendency to look at matters as they bore on the integrity of his own character and the sanctity of his own conscience. Thus in after life it is perfectly clear that he was not at all disposed to pronounce dogmatically on the rival claims of the Congregational, the Presbyterian, or the Episcopalian forms of church government, thinking, I imagine, that each had its recommendations and its dangers, its advantages and its drawbacks, and not unwilling personally to live under any one of them that secured him the opportunity of preaching and practising his religion.

But there was one thing about which he was under no hesitation, and that was, that that to which his word as a man and his faith as a Christian had been deliberately pledged, was for ever binding upon him; and that having once solemnly accepted holy orders from a presbytery, he could never, without a change of conviction, dare to pronounce them false and pretended, and accept re-ordination from the episcopate. So on this occasion the great national question—King or Parliament—did not seem to trouble him as one with which he had much to do, and indeed he thought that the university being a place designed for education and the acquisition of learning, the question of the mode of governing the nation was beside the mark to the young men studying. The matter that really concerned him he felt to be the personal one, whether he could with a safe conscience make this declaration, having so recently on his admission taken the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and he therefore sent in this answer: "I submit to the power of Parliament in this visitation as far as I may with a safe conscience and without perjury." However, this answer (it is intimated not without the favour of the Earl of Pembroke) was sufficient to keep him in his student's place. But the recollection of this difficulty used to make him

in after life signify his dislike of administering oaths to such as were scarce past children, who could hardly be supposed to take them with judgment, as oaths should be taken.

He did not think the displacements and substitutions were always for the best, but many, expecting another change soon, were exasperating in their carriage to the visitors, and the Parliament had plenty of its own friends ready to take their places, so that he did not wonder at, though he regretted, the extent and the severity of the changes. Yet nothing, after all, being required but a bare submission, which might be interpreted but as crying quarter, he afterwards thought that it could not be said that the terms were hard, especially, he significantly added, if compared with those of another nature imposed since.

At Oxford he duly performed the college exercises—disputations every day in term time, themes and verses once a week, and declamations when it came to his turn, in which performances he frequently came off with very great applause. Still he reproached himself in after life with not using with sufficient diligence his opportunities of self-improvement. He thought that he was too young, and would advise his friends not to thrust their children forth too soon from school to the university. “While they are children,” he says, “what can be expected but they should mind childish things?” His own school learning, too, was so much in advance of that of most of his fellow-students that it cost him no effort to keep up with them.

He found also two sets of young men there—the Parliamentarians, who were serious but of small ability, and the Royalists, who were better scholars, but generally not the better men. He was much puzzled with which chiefly to consort. The good were rather stupid, and the clever were not very good. At first, he inclined to the more alluring society, but he found as a consequence, “*Elangescere mox cæpit pristinae pietatis ardor.*” He began to be “too much in love with recreation, and in after life remembered with bitterness a certain bowling-green out of town, and a metheglin-house which I often went to for my morning draught, and it was such a draught as disfitted me for study after.” Seeing the danger he was in, he determined to renew his self-devotion to the Divine service. “Let this paper be my witness,” he writes, “that I do deliberately, of choice, and unreservedly, take God in Christ to be mine; and give myself to him, to be his, to love him, to fear him, to serve and obey him; and renouncing all my sins with hearty sorrow and detestation, I do cast myself only upon free grace, through the merits of Christ, for pardon and forgiveness; and do propose, God enabling me, from this day forward, more than ever, to exercise myself into godliness, and to walk in all the ways of religion as much as ever I can.”

After spending a year at Oxford, he had leave given him to

make a visit to his father at Whitehall, with whom he stayed some time. There he was January 30th, when the King was beheaded, and saw, as he says, "with a very sad heart, that tragical blow given." Two things he used to speak of that he took notice of himself that day. One was that at the instant when the blow was given, there was such a dismal universal groan among the thousands of people that were within sight of it, as it were with one consent, as he never heard before, and desired he might never hear the like again, nor see such a cause for it. The other was that, immediately after the stroke was struck, there was, according to order, one troop marching from Charing Cross towards King Street, and another from King Street towards Charing Cross, purposely to disperse and scatter the people, and to divert the dismal thoughts with which they could not but be filled, by driving them to shift every one for his own safety.

He upon all occasions testified his abhorrence of this (then) unparalleled action, which he always said was a thing that could not be justified; yet he said he could not see how it could be called a national sin; for, as the King urged upon his trial, it was certain that not one man of ten in the kingdom did consent to it. Nor could it be called the sin of the Long Parliament; for far the greatest part of them were at that time, while the thing was in agitation, imprisoned and kept under a force, and scarce twenty-seven of the forty that were left to carry the name of a Parliament did give their vote for it. But it was manifest that it was done by a prevailing party in the army, who, as he used to express it, having beaten their ploughshares into swords, could not so easily beat their swords into ploughshares again.

In 1650, he took his Bachelor of Arts degree, again thanking God for the friends He raised him up to help him. In Dec. 1652, he took his Master of Arts degree; and in January following preached his first sermon at South Hinksey, in Oxfordshire, on John viii. 34,—shewing thus early the tone of practical piety which he preserved as the peculiarity of his preaching all through his maturer and later life,—“Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin.” On this occasion he writes in his diary, “The Lord make use of me as an instrument of his glory and his Church’s good in this high and holy calling!”

In the latter years of his university career it is evident that the religious tone of the university became more such as to suit his own serious disposition. The university sermons in the afternoon of the Lord’s-day, which had previously been preached by the fellows of colleges in their course, and were therefore of very unequal merit and usefulness, were now consigned to the high character and talents of Dr. Owen, the Vice-chancellor, and Dr. Goodwin, President of Magdalen; and the young masters that had been accustomed to preach at that time had a lecture appointed them on Tuesday. Many of the scholars also used to

meet together for prayer and Christian conference, to the great confirming of one another's hearts in the fear and love of God, and the preparing of them for the service of the church.

His character and abilities had made him so well known in the university, notwithstanding his extraordinary modesty and humility, that in the following Act, July 1653, he was chosen out of all the Masters of that year to be junior of the Act, that is, to answer the philosophy questions in *Vesperis*, which he did with very great applause, especially for the very witty and ingenious orations which he made to the university upon that occasion. His questions were—1. *An licitum sit carnibus vesci?* (Is it lawful to eat flesh-meat?) which he affirmed. 2. *An institutio academiarum sit utilis in republicâ?* (Is the institution of colleges useful in a state?) which he affirmed. 3. *An ingenium pendeat ab humoribus corporis?* (Does the state of one's brain depend upon the humours of the body?) which he affirmed. At the Act in 1654, he was chosen Magister replicans, and answered the philosophy questions with like applause. His questions then were—1. *An melius sit sperare quàm frui?* (Is it better to hope than to enjoy?) which he denied. 2. *An maxima animi delectatio sit a sensibus?* (Is the greatest pleasure of the mind derived from the senses?) on which he also took the negative. 3. *An utile sit peregrinari?* (Is it useful to travel?) which he affirmed. One of his juniors in the university, at that time a stranger to him, mentioned how much he admired these exercises of his and loved him for them, and yet how much more he admired, when he afterwards became acquainted with him in the country, that so curious and polite an orator should become so profitable and powerful a preacher.

And now, not by his own wishes or efforts, but by the providence of God, the separation from his much-loved studies and companionships at the university, and his devotion to the ministry of Jesus Christ, drew nigh. A pious and gifted lady, residing in that part of the little Welsh county of Flint which is separated from the rest, and is in point of language and usages, and everything but geography and law, a part of Shropshire, wrote to Oxford for a young scholar to come to reside as chaplain in the family, to finish the preparation of the young men for the university, and to preach as minister of the parish. This lady was the wife of John Puleston, one of the Judges of the Common Pleas, the chief proprietor of the parish and the owner of the tithes. She was a friend of the celebrated Selden, and herself a person of learning and culture as well as of a serious and religious disposition. Yielding to the pressure of this persuasion, the young scholar consented to undertake the duties required of him for six months, on consideration that only one public service a week should be expected from him, as he was only twenty-two, and that assistance should be procured for him for the other

parts of the day, and that he should be at liberty to return to the university to continue his studies at the end of this term.

But the usual result of such an arrangement with an earnest young man ensued. He found that life had graver duties than the study of the classics or even the study of the Scriptures; and in knowledge spread, consciences awakened, manners and morals improved, religion respected and sought after, he discovered that the study which had been hitherto (and very properly) a kind of end of life to him, was in fact but the preparation, the foundation, for a nobler and more disinterested calling; and while to the end of his days continuing and enlarging those studies, he was for ever applying them to the service of God, the benefit of man, and the culture of his own nature. "It is a good sign," wrote Lady Puleston to him, "that most are loath to part with you; and you have done more good in this half year than I have discerned these eighteen years."

However, he returned to Oxford in the spring, Lady Puleston soon joining him there with her five sons, the two eldest of whom she placed under his charge in the college; and he continued in his student's place at Christ Church for two or three years, attending the service of it once a year, but disposing of most of the profit of it for the use of poor scholars there. In the October of this year he received a very solemn and affectionate invitation from Judge Puleston and the parishioners of Worthenbury, which, acting on his principle, "to follow Providence and not to force it," he accepted, and in the ensuing winter went down to settle there. There, in that fine old Elizabethan house of the Pulestons, Emral, he continued for some years, at first adding to his other duties that of tutor to the young men, discharging the offices not of a conventional but of an actual and earnest chaplaincy, being the assiduous religious friend and personal instructor of every member of the household, down to the humblest servant, and preaching regularly once, and very soon twice, a Sunday at the parish church.

Worthenbury was at that time a kind of chapelry, dependent on the neighbouring rectory of Bangor-ys-coed, or Bangor Monachorum,* but the tithes belonged to the Emral family, subject to a small fine to Bangor. These tithes the Judge was now willing to settle on the minister of Worthenbury for ever. But to put it in a form that he thought would save his young chaplain time and annoyance, he charged his own estates in Flintshire, Denbighshire and Cheshire, with an amount (£100 a-year) greater than the produce of the tithe, and made it payable to Philip Henry as long as he remained minister of Worthenbury, with power of distress in case of non-payment. This grant he made by deed two years after Philip Henry's first arrival. Two

* This Bangor, in Flintshire, must not be confused with the better known and more important Bangor in Carnarvonshire.

years again after this (1657), Philip Henry finding that some of the family who were not inclined *patrizare*, were uneasy at his presence, and he himself being anxious for that quiet and simplicity of life, and that freedom from what he called "snares and temptations," which were difficult to be had in a great house; and Judge Puleston, perceiving his desire, generously built him a very handsome house in Worthenbury, not far from the church, and settled it upon him by lease for sixty years, so long as he continued minister at Worthenbury, and did not accept better preferment, which better preferment when on two occasions offered him he declined. He was then ordained; and two years after again, in 1659, he was formally collated, nominated and presented to the church at Worthenbury by Judge Puleston, and "approved therefor by the Commissioners appointed for the approbation of public preachers, having for peace' sake also desired and received the consent to his appointment of the neighbouring rector of Bangor."

I mention all these particulars on account of their bearing on the public legal position of the Presbyterian clergy, and because Philip Henry shewed in them that accuracy and care which distinguished him as a man of business all his life.

Two years previously, however, to this last formal collation to the living, and nearly four years after his first coming to Emral, being settled in his house and satisfied of his vocation to the ministry and his fitness to the people of his charge, he made final arrangements for his long-deferred ordination, in September, 1657, a service which was conducted with great precision and solemnity. In July previously, he had submitted to examination by the Presbytery. He preached and disputed before them—was examined by them in Greek, Hebrew, Logic, Natural Philosophy, Divinity and Church History. He presented his certificates of character and attainment, and underwent examination as to his spiritual state and fitness for the work. On the Sunday before the ordination, a notice was read in the church at Worthenbury, and afterwards affixed to the church door, "that if any one could produce any just exceptions against the doctrine or life of the said Mr. Henry, or any sufficient reason why he might not be ordained, they should certify the same to the classis or the scribe, and it should be heard and considered."

On the day of the ordination there was a very great assembly gathered together, and, after prayer and sermon by two of the ministers present, young Henry made his profession of faith. He said, "The ground and rule of my faith towards God is the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. I believe they were written by holy men immediately inspired by the Holy Ghost; having found the efficacy of them in some measure upon my own heart, I believe they are further able to make me wise to salvation."

“Concerning God, I believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of those that diligently seek him. The Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the Godhead I receive and own as a truth, I admire and adore as a mystery; though no man hath seen God at any time, yet the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him; and what he hath declared concerning him, that I believe. I believe that God is a Spirit, for the Son hath said, ‘God is a Spirit.’ I believe that he hath life in himself, and that he hath given the Son to have life in himself. I believe that all things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made. I believe by his providence he preserves, guides and governs all the creatures according to the purpose of his own will and to his glory: for the Father worketh hitherto and the Son also worketh.”

He believes that God made man upright, but that he fell by sin, and that we were all in the loins of our first parents, who stood and fell as public persons; and that on that account justly, and without any colour of wrong, we share in the guilt of their disobedience in the consequent corruption of their nature, “so that we came into the world children of wrath and heirs of the curse, one as well as another; enemies of God, hating Him and hated of Him; averse to what is good and prone to all manner of evil; that, though all are born in this condition, there are some that do not die in it.”

He believes in Christ as the Mediator between God and man and the Intercessor for men. He believes that the righteousness of Christ alone is the matter of our justification. He believes in the sanctification of man by the Spirit, though that it is not perfected till we come to glory. He believes in the two sacraments of the New Testament as signs and seals of the covenant of grace.

He believes that when the body returns to the dust, the soul returns to God to receive at once from him the sentence: “Come, inherit the kingdom,” or, “Depart, accursed, into everlasting fire.” But he believes that, besides this, there is a day of general judgment at the end of the world, when our bodies shall by an act of almighty power be raised from the dust, be reunited to our souls, and be for ever in happiness or misery together.

Now those who are accustomed to examine the cautiously-worded and carefully-weighed language of creeds, articles and solemn declarations of faith on the one hand, and loose, popular, inferential and declamatory versions of that language on the other, will recognize at once the carefully moderate tone of the whole of this declaration of faith, except the amazingly strong statement on the inherited guilt, corruption and curse of man, which would surely have satisfied Calvin himself.

Of the harshness of this one statement, I find no traces in his

subsequent life and teachings, and am inclined to regard it as the vehement and self-rebuking language of a remarkably conscientious, pure-minded, earnest young man, detesting sin from his heart, and loathing every deviation from the highest Christian holiness of which he had felt himself to have been guilty. But of the moderation of the rest of this profession of faith, his whole life and teachings abound in evidence.

Then followed seven searching questions as to the spirit with which he was entering on his holy calling, and the objects at which he should aim in the fulfilment of it. The answers to these are characterized by that modesty, charity and self-searching humility, which continued to the end to be part of the man. A very sincere rather than a very courageous man, he derived his subsequent fortitude and endurance, not from his temperament, but from his conscience, and at this early age he saw this and knew it as plainly, apparently, as he did forty years after.

"What," says the seventh question to him, "What if troubles, persecutions and discouragements arise, will you hold out to the end notwithstanding?" and his sincere and truthful answer, not going in the warmth of this early age one word beyond the exact fulfilment of his later life, and his actual encounter with those persecutions, here only imagined, was: "Concerning this, I am very jealous over my own heart; and there is cause: I find great want of that zeal and courage for God which I know is required in a minister of the gospel; nevertheless, I persuade myself that 'no temptation shall befall me but such as is common to man; and that God, who is faithful, will not suffer me to be tempted above that which I am able, but that with the temptation he will make a way to escape, that I may be able to bear it.' I promise faithfulness to the death; but I rest not at all on *my* promise to God, but on *his* promise to me: 'When thou goest through the fire and through the water I will be with thee.'"

His answer to the third question is also characteristic of the man, and verified by the man throughout his whole life. He is asked, "Do you mean to be zealous and faithful in the defence of truth and unity, against error and schism?" and after declaring, in reply, his resolution "to watch in all things, to contend earnestly for the faith, and in meekness to instruct those that oppose themselves," he adds, "And for peace and unity, if my heart deceive me not, I shall rather choose to hazard the loss of anything that is most dear to me, than be any way knowingly accessory to the disturbance of these in the churches of Christ."

As in the declaration of faith, so in the answers to these questions, there is one intensity, which is equally startling from the mouth of one who, even at this early age, had in full possession the afterwards so eminently displayed gifts of candour and

Christian love, but which, as to the end characteristic both of the man and of the times, I now quote—"What (Qu. 4) is your persuasion of the truth of the Reformed religion?" and his answer is, "My persuasion is, that the Bishop of Rome is that man of sin and son of perdition whom the Lord Jesus will consume with the spirit of his mouth, and whom he will destroy by the brightness of his coming; and the separation which our first Reformers made, I do heartily rejoice in and bless God for; for had we still continued to partake with him in his sins, we should in the end have partaken with him also in his plagues."

When the declaration of faith had thus been duly made and the questions answered, the presbyters present engaged in prayer, laying their hands on his head, with the words, "Whom we do thus in Thy name set apart to the work and office of the ministry." Five more young men were then ordained in the same manner, an exhortation to them all was given by one of the ministers, and instruments in parchment given them, bearing, in the case of Philip Henry, these words:

"Whereas Mr. Philip Henry, of Worthenbury, in the county of Flint, Master of Arts, hath addressed himself unto us, authorized by an ordinance of both Houses of Parliament of the 29th of August, 1648, for the ordination of ministers, desiring to be ordained a Presbyter, for that he is chosen and appointed for the work of the ministry at Worthenbury, in the county of Flint, as by a certificate now remaining with us touching that his election and appointment, appeareth; and he having likewise exhibited a sufficient testimonial of his diligence and proficiency in his studies, and unblameableness of his life and conversation, he hath been examined according to the rules for examination in the said ordinance expressed; and thereupon approved, there being no just exception made, nor put in against his ordination and admission.

"These may therefore testify to all whom it may concern, that upon the 16th day of September, 1657, we have proceeded solemnly to set him apart for the office of a Presbyter and work of the ministry of the Gospel by laying on of our hands with fasting and prayer. By virtue whereof, we do declare him to be a lawful sufficiently authorized minister of Jesus Christ; and having good evidence of his lawful and fair calling, not only to the work of the ministry but to the exercise thereof at the chapel of Worthenbury, in the county of Flint, we do hereby send him thither, and actually admit him to the said charge, to perform all the offices and duties of a faithful pastor there, exhorting the people, in the name of Jesus Christ, willingly to receive and acknowledge him as the minister of Christ, and to maintain and encourage him in the execution of his office, that he may be able to give up such an account to Christ of their obedience to his ministry, as may be to his joy and their everlasting comfort.

"In witness whereof, we the Presbyters of the Fourth Class, in the county of Salop, commonly called Bradford North Class, have hereunto set our hands, this 16th day of September, in the year of our Lord God, 1657.

"THOMAS PORTER, Moderator for the Time, and four others."

This classis in twelve years' time publicly ordained with similar formalities sixty-two other ministers; and I have been more particular in giving a detailed account of the solemnities customary on these occasions, because it was upon the nature, sufficiency and bindingness of their ordination more than upon any other,—more probably with many than all the other questions put together,—that the further question of conforming and non-conforming in 1662 turned as on a hinge. And it was upon the nature of services such as this which we have been now considering at the little village of Prees, in Shropshire, more than upon any other point at issue, that that great and fruitful event in English and in ecclesiastical history, whose Bicentenary we are this year observing, depended.

I need not go much into the minutiae of his life during the eight years of his ministry at Worthenbury. They are the records of a good man's life and a good minister's. His parishioners consisted chiefly of poor tenants and labouring husbandmen; but the souls of such, he used to say, are as precious as the souls of the rich, and to be looked after accordingly.

He established classes of catechumens, including at first some of the adult who had been neglected; he established monthly lectures in the church; monthly conferences in private houses; visited the sick, aiming as he said by his prayers and exhortations at the good, not only of those that were sick, but also their friends and relations who were about them; he administered the Lord's Supper with peculiar preparation and solemnity. He preached funeral sermons for all that were buried at his church, rich or poor, old or young, or little children; for he looked upon it as an opportunity of doing good. In visiting the sick, he declined the private administration of the Lord's Supper to them, as judging it not consonant to the rule and intention of the ordinance. He very rarely, if ever, baptized in private, but would have children brought to the solemn assembly on the Lord's-day; and I observe that the address on such occasions, as surely in any rational conception of that service it ought to be, was made directly and earnestly to the parents.

He was very unwilling to give offence or pain to any one, yet would plainly and faithfully reprove what he saw amiss in any, and would not suffer sin upon them. He had, in the very natural reaction of the age, the Puritan objection to village feasts and merry-makings, not surely on account of the mirth, but of the misery that attended them; and once, hearing of such a meeting at an ale-house on a Saturday night, he went himself and broke it up and scattered them.

“This having those that were his charge about him, made him all his days bear his testimony to parish order, where it may be had on good terms, as much more eligible and more likely to answer the end than the congregational way of gathering churches

from places far distant; and he often wished and prayed for the opening of a door by which to return to that order again, though he would say, "We must do what we can when we cannot do what we would." For this reason he did not like people to come out of other parishes to attend his services, but this he could not prevent; his piety and devotion, his industry and knowledge, his self-denial and humility, and his earnest, persuasive address, winning for him the respect and attachment of all, and the popular designation of Heavenly Henry. He frequently preached at Christ Church before the University of Oxford with great acceptableness, and not only constantly undertook the week-day lectures of his neighbourhood, but was a frequent hearer of those of others, with a special view, as his ample notes shew, to his own personal advancement in godliness.

So great were his labours that his delicate constitution early shewed signs of giving way under them, but he could not be induced to moderate them. He carefully disposed of a tenth part of his income to the poor, especially the teaching of poor children; and those who did not need his gifts, treasured up his sayings, among which were such as these: "Short sins often cost us long sorrows;" "A man cannot wrestle with God and wrangle with his neighbour at the same time;" "Those who are too merry when pleased, are commonly too angry when crossed;" "It is not so much our differences of opinion as the mismanagement of those differences that do us mischief." Though very gentle, courteous and willing to oblige, yet being once pressed to sign a certificate for one with whom he was not sufficiently acquainted, he refused, giving this reason, that "he preferred the peace of his own conscience to the friendship of all the men in the world."

In Sept. 1658, Lady Puleston died. "She was," says he, "the best friend I had on earth; but my Friend in heaven is still where he was." Within a year after, Judge Puleston died, and all his interest in the Emral family was buried in his grave.

He now began to be discontented with the governing powers, and rather sympathized with the "risings;" his prayer for Sir George Booth's Cheshire rising being, "Lord, own them, if they truly own thee." The forces of the Parliament, however, came down under Lambert, and put that rising down. They seemed to favour the Quakers and to offer injury to some of the ministers; he thought, therefore, that they could not prosper; and some of the soldiers coming to hear him on the Sunday, and one of them keeping on his hat during the singing, he publicly rebuked him; and there being many Anabaptists among them, he recorded it as a good providence that the questions in the Catechism concerning baptism came in course to be expounded on that day.

The army becoming now the ruling power in the country, he

was, with the Presbyterians generally, a hearty well-wisher to the return of the King in April, 1660, although he and they mingled their fears with their hopes; and, notwithstanding the fair promises of the King, had their doubts both about their own treatment and the cause of religion and morality, so that in after years he called the day of the Restoration, *ἡ ἡμέρα αὐτὰ ἡ γλυκυπικρα*, "that sweet-bitter day."

Just about the time of the King's return, in April, 1660, his marriage, which had been some time under negotiation, took place with Katherine, the only daughter and heiress of Daniel Matthews, a gentleman of some small landed property at Broad Oak in the immediate neighbourhood. Land being then, as now, very heavy, and learning very light, many objections were raised against the connection, and among others this, that, although Mr. Henry was a gentleman and a scholar and an excellent preacher, he was quite a stranger, and they did not even know where he came from; the future Catherine Henry observed, "True, but I know where he is going, and I should like to go with him."

But within six months of his marriage, the public troubles on ecclesiastical matters having come on, we find him writing to his wife from London. "I bless God I am safe and well at London. I met many soldiers on their way going homewards upon their disbanding, and I was sometimes afraid, but the Lord preserved me. This morning I came to Chelsea, where I saw my sisters in health, blessed be God, and overjoyed to see me. I have received a letter for Sir Orlando Bridgman, the Lord Keeper, and to-morrow purpose, God willing, to wait upon his Lordship, expecting a charge from him, in the first place, about conformity, wherein yet I shall do as I see cause, in case I should be continued at Worthenbury. The ministers here (i.e. the Presbyterian ministers) are generally unanimous and resolved. Dr. Sheldon was installed Bishop of London to-day. The King is gone into the country for a fortnight, during the trial of his father's judges, to prevent petitions." This letter plunges us at once into the midst of his ecclesiastical relations. The Sheldon here spoken of had been before the interregnum Archbishop of Canterbury, had been faithful during the alteration of his fortunes to the King, was now made Bishop of London, afterwards promoted to his old see of Canterbury, took a distinguished part in the Savoy Conferences, and was severe on all Nonconformists. Lord Keeper Bridgman was son of John, Bishop of Chester, and brother of Henry Bridgman, the sequestered rector of Bangor, to which Worthenbury had formerly belonged as a chapelry or dependency.

The whole tone of the country was now rapidly changing; the smothered feelings of the Royalists and the friends of the Church and Liturgy as formerly established now burst forth; many who

had been attached to the dynasty of Cromwell in politics and the Presbyterian party in religion, were now become tired of both, and welcomed back the King, the old ways and the old Church of the nation. Young people had felt very painfully the restraints of Puritanism, and, without perhaps very distinctly knowing the evils and oppressions that had been connected with the former order of things which Puritanism had supplanted, sighed for the return of a more cheerful style of manners, a more graceful, attractive, and perhaps less uncompromising and rigorous religion. To all these—a large proportion of the nation—the differences in forms of government and religious observances in points of faith and modes of worship did not appear of importance. The Royal Family had bitterly suffered, and perhaps it was thought sufficiently atoned for their faults and follies and mistakes; the Church would have learned lessons of prudence and of duty in exile and sequestration; the King had promised the Presbyterians every consideration in return for their helping him back to his country and his throne. All the partizans of the old state of things returned to life. Everywhere cropped up the old sequestered rector, the ill-starred curate, the offended and degraded country gentleman; and the Royalist nobleman and the exiled bishop were ready to put themselves at the head of this army of reaction; and the fickle people, always tiring of what they have tried, and hoping something better from a change, were glad to see the old pageantries and revelries reviving and the conduits flowing with wine. Fourteen years is not a long enough space in national life to allow of a total change in any nation. A whole generation at least must pass away before the old is forgotten and the new secure. The Presbyterians themselves, constituting then the greatest party both in Church and State, consented to, and to a great extent longed for, the change; trusting to the promises of the Court and to their own strength for securing such an amalgamation of interests and powers as would, with the help of the best men of the Episcopalian party, ensure liberty of worship for both sides, and purity of morals and religion for all. But I must abstain, though it is difficult, from all generalizations, and trust to the details of the life itself to bring out the full character of the events of these times and the principles involved in them.

The sequestered rector of Bangor, Dr. Bridgman, was now restored, and Philip Henry of course perceived that, though no steps were yet taken against him, his, a short time since apparently so well-secured, position at Worthenbury was likely to be shaken; but he writes, "Lord, if my work be done here, provide some other for this people that may be more skilful and more successful, and cut out work for me elsewhere. However, I will take nothing ill that God doth with me." Dr. Bridgman seems to have behaved at first with courtesy and forbearance towards him,

assuring him (as for his own part he probably intended) that he should never remove him till the law did, but that he must, in the mean time, consider himself as his curate. But with all his mildness, Philip Henry cannot conceal his disgust at the kind of arguments which were principally used to induce him to conform,—arguments so worldly and degrading to a man of his purity and conscientiousness, and so silly and servile to a man of his independence of character and thorough acquaintance with the subject. Being in conversation on the question with the Dean and Chancellor of Chester and others, he says the great argument they used to persuade him to conform was, that else he would lose his preferment; and, “What!” said they, “you are a young man, and are you wiser than the King and Bishops?” On which he simply remarks, “God grant that I may never be left to consult with flesh and blood in such matters.” He writes, however, to Dr. Bridgman, “I think I am none of those who are in the extremes; nevertheless, my resolution is, if those things be indispensably imposed which I cannot practise without sinning against my conscience, I shall choose rather to lose all.”

So anxious, however, were some people to anticipate that they outran the law, and presented him twice, in Sept. 1660 and spring 1661, at the Flint assizes for not reading the Common Prayer, but the presentment of course fell. The settlement which had been made by Judge Puleston upon him, in lieu of tithe, was now withheld by the family at Emral, who had become very much opposed to him. Many attempts were made in 1661 to interrupt his praying and preaching, and he says, “Methinks sabbaths were never so sweet with me as they are now, at such uncertainties.”

On Jan. 31st, 1661, he writes in his diary, “Things are low with me in the world—but threepence left.”

The Pulestons made it a condition of the re-adjustment of the tithe to Dr. Bridgman's satisfaction, that he should dismiss Philip Henry from Worthenbury, which accordingly he did, coming over himself on the 24th October, and reading over his discharge before a rabble, “the circumstances whereof, place, manner and witnesses,” Philip Henry says, “somewhat grieved me;” and notice was given in the church of Worthenbury of that dismissal by one of Mr. Puleston's servants on the following Sunday, Oct. 27th, on which day he accordingly preached his farewell sermon from the text, “Only let your conversation be as becomes the gospel of Christ.” “It matters not what becomes of me,” he said, “whether I come unto you or else be absent; but let your conversation be as becomes the gospel;” and his parting prayer for them was, that “the Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh, would set a man over the congregation.” Thus he ceased in 1661 to preach to his people there, but he ceased not to love them and to pray for them.

The beauty of the man's character and temper were shewn in

the farther facts that he attended the public services of his successor, who was immediately appointed, and once, being allowed the liberty of gesture, he joined in the Lord's Supper. "He advised his successor the best he could in the soul affairs of his people, which," says he, "he seemed to take well. I am sure I meant it so, and the Lord make him faithful." He preached occasionally in the neighbourhood for the intervening nine months, until Bartholomew's-day, 1662, and then, as he could not conform to the Act of Uniformity, he was silenced on that day, which was his birthday; and on its anniversary a year after he says, "This day thirty-two years I was born; this day twelvemonth I died."

I need not describe to you at length the reasons that drove him, and necessarily drove him as an honest man, into Nonconformity. It was not that he had an insuperable objection to episcopacy, to which in a modified form he did not at that time so seriously object as a mode of governing the Church; it was not that he objected to the doctrines prescribed, for they were substantially his own; but he thought the imposition of certain observances and ceremonies against the known preferences and conscientious convictions of a large number of ministers was in itself unjustifiable and even wicked, and he could not, without telling a lie, say that he gave his assent *ex animo* to all and everything contained in the Book of Common Prayer.

But supposing that he could by any possible explanation have got over these difficulties, there was one which remained which nothing could remove. You remember his ordination, its deliberateness and solemnity, the questions, answers, profession of faith, prayers, laying on of hands, public notices, certificates. It was an essential condition of his conforming in the diocese in which he lived that he should subscribe this declaration: "I, Philip Henry, do now utterly renounce and cast away as worthless my pretended letters of ordination formerly obtained from certain presbyters, humbly supplicating that the Rev. Father and Lord in Christ, the Lord George, by divine permission Bishop of Chester, would deign to admit me to the sacred order of deaconship [the lowest order], according to the custom and rites of the English Church."

For the credit of the blood that runs in my veins, for the credit of the character of Englishmen, for the pure name and fame of the ministry of Jesus Christ, for the honour and sanctity of the Christian faith, for the sake of integrity and truth throughout the human race, for the sake of liberty, civil and religious, all over the world,—I thank God, I call on all here to thank God, I call on every Englishman, I call on every Christian, I call on every honest man in the world, to whatever party, church, sect, faith, tribe or nation he may belong, to thank God that there was found heart of oak enough in this nation for Two Thousand

men to go forth on the same day, from posts of emolument and honour and usefulness, into penury and obscurity and silence, rather than violate their inner conscience, and declare in the presence of God and man the thing they did not believe! The differences between these two great parties in the nation—political, ecclesiastical, religious—vanish and disappear into nothing compared with the one stupendous difference to the nation between two thousand men going forth as martyrs to their honesty, and two thousand men staying where they were in cowardice, hypocrisy and self-indulgence.

It is quite manifest, from every act and word of Philip Henry's life, that he believed that the essentials of religion might all be preserved under either the Presbyterian or the Episcopalian mode of administration; and although his preferences, both from education and temperament, were for the former, he never would have been instrumental, on the ground of the differences involved in that distinction, in splitting the Nation and the Church, had it not been that, in addition to these differences, certain requirements were made, and it is to be feared purposely made, with which he and the honest men of his party never could concur except at the sacrifice of their personal honour and veracity; and though all through his life he never blamed any one for conforming who could do so with a clear conscience (nay, he himself to a great extent conformed as a private worshiper for years to the services of the Church), and sincerely and equally honoured good and true men of both parties, he yet felt that religion itself would perish if the ministers of truth were to enter upon their office with a deliberate falsehood, and that it would be worthless to agree about the machinery and scaffolding of their building if the temple itself was rotten in its foundation.

English law had not then learnt to understand, and English society does not yet understand, that instead of disrespect and slight and suspicion and avoidance and restraint, the highest reverence is due to, and the highest confidence should be placed in, those men who, pure in their lives and religious in their feelings, standing apart from the current of the world's smiles and honours and emoluments, dare to utter the honest thought that is within them, and that they constitute, to whatever party they belong, the true and everlasting loyalty of the nation and the stability of their times. For this reason I honour as much, where their character was as good and their sincerity as great, those men who a dozen years before, being advocates of royalty, episcopacy and a liturgy, refused to presbyterianize, and left the Solemn League and Covenant to those who believed in it to join it.

But this good man is now by the law of the land silenced and driven into privacy. He quietly gives up the house that had been built for him, and leaves the threescore years during which it was to be his own, if he lived there so long, as the record only

of a parchment. He takes his young wife and his first-born son, pitches his tent under the Broad Oak, and cultivates the acres that spread around it. There the smoke of his daily sacrifice ariseth, and he establishes a church in his own house. There he studies in private that word of God which he had taken in public as his guide, and preaches and expounds its lessons with as much labouriousness and care as he had been wont to expend in its more public exposition. There he gathers his children, his servants, his workpeople, and the stranger that was so often within his gates, for domestic worship and instruction, avoiding those hours in which the like duties were discharged in the church of his parish, and even meekly going with his family to attend those services, and to sit with his silent eloquence a listener at the feet of the instructor that was appointed him.

It is difficult to conceive of any one having the heart to wish to molest a man so conducting himself and so circumstanced. He was living on his own land; he was living in absolute privacy; he was living some miles away from the place where he had any public influence; he was living in full obedience to the laws; he had taken the oath of allegiance to the King, and no one could pretend for a moment to suppose that he who had sacrificed so much for his oath's sake would ever think of violating it;—yet when the persecuting enactment called the Five-Mile Act was passed, by which it was forbidden any Nonconformist minister to *come* or to *be* within five miles of any corporation or of any place where he had been a minister, unless he would swear never at any time to attempt any alteration of the government in the Church or State,—an Act which exiled many poor ministers from the only homes they had and drove them up and down the nation,—it was attempted to drive him away from Broad Oak, because it was but four reputed miles from the utmost limits of Worthenbury parish; but he had the distance measured, and according to the statute length of a mile, by the Act of Elizabeth, it was found to be five miles and sixty yards; but so bitter were his enemies, that he had to go away and live among his friends for some time.

Again, for the purpose of throwing insult upon himself and disparagement upon his orders, they appointed him a sub-collector for the tax of two millions and a half just granted as an aid to the King. He felt it as a cross, he said; but there was no remedy, so he took it up as a cross, seeing that the duty was properly discharged by the persons he employed for the purpose, and saying, with that quiet humour which underran his Puritan gravity like a blue vein across a strong hand, that he hoped he should deserve the inscription mentioned in Suetonius, *καλως τελωνησαντι*, “To an honest publican.” Besides these petty attempts to annoy him, he was taken prisoner, and confined for some days in the prison of the little neighbouring village of

Hanmer, on the pretence of his being engaged in some plot against the government; but there being no evidence of any kind against him, the detention ceased.

But when they would let him alone, this was the life he led.

In May, 1668, the bitterness of the Five-Mile Act, falsely and maliciously applied to him, being abated, at least in his neighbourhood, he returned to Broad Oak, where without material interruption he was permitted to remain the rest of his life, for twenty-eight years. Here he applied himself to the management of his property as a steward of God, writing at the beginning of his account-book the words—"Honour the Lord with thy substance and with the first-fruits of all thine increase; so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine." He devoted himself to the employment and instruction of the labourers around him; was an example of exactness and punctuality in all accounts with his tenants, workmen and every one who had any transactions with him; he was a prudent manager of his own concerns, and a most prudent and valuable counsellor to his neighbours, and was frequently an arbitrator and preventer of law-suits among them. He was very forward to lend money to the poor, where he thought they could make good use of it, saying that in many cases there was more charity in lending than in giving. Though it sorely interfered with his beloved studies, he was very useful in the affairs of the neighbourhood; and though it was indeed a narrow sphere of activity for him, yet such as it was, "men gave ear and waited, and kept silence at his counsel;" and at a later period of life, the government wished to put him on the Commission of the Peace, but as this was offered to him of course as a layman, he declined it.

His house was on the road-side, on which he congratulated himself, as it enabled him the oftener to see his friends who were passing, and to be kind to strangers and wanderers. When the latter met him on the road, he would listen to their tale and relieve them, and accompany this, if he thought the tale true, with a blessing—if he thought it false, with a rebuke; but he would frequently tell them, in addition, to go on to the house, lest they might, he thought, faint or be weary by the way. He never would keep poor people, who wanted to see him, waiting, because, he said, their time was their bread. He was noted for an extraordinary neatness about his house and ground, which, he would often say, he could not endure to see like the field of the slothful and the vineyard of the man void of understanding. "And it was strange," says his celebrated son Matthew, "how easily one that had been bred up utterly a stranger to such things, yet, when God so ordered his lot, acquainted himself with and accommodated himself to the affairs of the country, making it the diversion of his vacant hours to oversee his garden and his fields, when he better understood that known epode of Horace,

‘Beatus ille qui procul negotiis,’ than he did when in his youth he made an ingenious translation of it.”

The simplicity and piety of the man may be shewn by two extracts from his diary on this class of subjects. “The garden finished in time of an eclipse. Lord, lift up upon me the light of thy countenance, and let nothing cloud it towards my soul.” “Hawthorn sets planted to hedge in the orchard. Lord, be thou a wall of fire round about thy church, and let not the wild boar out of the forest devour thy tender plants.”

But with all his many outward occupations, his life was still a life of prayer—personal and private prayer, family prayer, praise, and reading and expounding the Scriptures morning and evening; and he would tell people that it would be a great preserver of order and decency in a family, and be like a hem to all their other business to keep it from ravelling. “He was ever careful,” says his son, “to have all his family present: though, sometimes living in the country, he had a great household, yet he would have not only his children, and sojourners, if he had any, and domestic servants, but his workmen and day-labourers; and as it was an act of his charity many times to set them to work for him, so that he added this act of piety to set them to work for God.” On the Sundays, according to the Puritan ideal and custom, these services were multiplied and lengthened, and the more public services, whether at church or as afterwards in his own meeting-place, were added to these, so that the voice of prayer and praise and teaching was never dropped for an hour together from morning to night. As long as he attended the service of the Church, the clergyman who came from a neighbouring town dined with him; and afterwards, when he had public services of his own, those who came from a distance joined the family at their short mid-day meal.

Yet no man ever had a more hearty fear and horror of a religion of the lips. Nothing was more earnest and constant than his reminder that the gospel was a religion of *commandments* as well as *promises*; and he always pressed the religion of duty as well as faith, of daily life on earth as well as future hope in heaven. He would tell of a so-called religious lady being startled to a sense of practical religion by overhearing a neighbour, coming in and finding the good woman, far in the day, in her closet, and the house sadly neglected, children not tended, servants not minded, &c., say, “What! is there no fear of God in this house?” He would say, “There are quarter-believers and half-believers; but the whole-believer is he that assents, applies, is affected, and acts according to what he says he believes.” Having once explained in a course of sermons all our Lord’s sayings in the Sermon on the Mount, he pressed upon his hearers in conclusion the necessity of *doing* as well as *hearing* those sayings, and said, “What ado, some one will object, is here about

doing—doing! If I had preached these sermons I know where, I had certainly been called a legal preacher, if not a papist, a jesuit, a preacher of works, and some would have said, We will never hear him again. If to preach on these things be legal preaching, then our Lord himself was a legal preacher, and his sayings have been my texts. Such a preacher as he was, may I, in my poor measure, be! I cannot write after a better copy. I cannot tread in better steps. His sayings must be done as well as heard, that we may answer his end in saying them, which was to promote holiness—that we may approve ourselves his true kindred—that God may be glorified—that our profession may be beautified—and that our building may stand.”

“You go home,” he once said to a pious lady who had been complaining to him of her husband—“You go home and be a better wife to him, and he will be a better husband to you.”

Among other practical violations of a genuine piety, for which he had no tolerance, was the habit of evil-speaking and back-biting: these he would sometimes drive away with an angry countenance. He gave it as a rule, which is exactly the opposite to what people of the world always do, “never to speak of any one’s faults to others till we have first spoken of them to the offender himself.” This rule he not only laid down, but observed; and once being asked to give an account of some one who had done wrong, he began, but suddenly stopped, saying, “But our rule is to speak evil of no man;” and he could not be induced to renew the subject.

It is not to be supposed that in the midst of his own comparative affluence and comfort, which made him sometimes look round his little paradise and exclaim with wondering gratitude, “What, all this, and heaven besides!” he would be unmindful of his brethren in bonds and affliction; but he has put it on record as a fact worthy of notice, that notwithstanding the grievous straits and difficulties in which they were so often placed,—cruel laws forbidding them to preach, forbidding them to teach, forbidding them to obtain any occupation or to live within five miles of any corporate town, forbidding them to live within five miles of any place where they had ever been settled and known as ministers,—such was the blessing of God in prospering their exertions or raising them up kind friends, that he never heard of one Nonconformist minister being imprisoned for debt, and that in an age when imprisonment for debt was a very common occurrence in every neighbourhood.

But the little liberty that had thus for a few years been enjoyed of praying and preaching privately in his own house or the houses of his friends was now restricted. There being a drought in the country, Philip Henry met a few friends in a private house to pray for the aversion of this sign, as they conceived it, of God’s anger. For this and similar sins he was fined,

his goods distrained, and himself presented at the Flintshire assizes more than once; but the brutal Judge Jeffreys, who presided, happening to know him as a former friend of his mother's, and as having sometimes, at that mother's request, examined himself as a boy in his studies, suffered, to the surprise of the magistrates, the presentments to fall through.

The new Bishop of St. Asaph, Dr. Lloyd, one of the afterwards celebrated seven, took a different, and it must be acknowledged a somewhat more sensible and Christian way of reducing him to a proper way of thinking. He summoned him, with others, to a public discussion of their differences; and afterwards, being so pleased with his demeanour on that occasion, requested a private interview with him, which ended in the bishop's very candidly avowing that he did not consider him a *σχισματικός*, but only a *παρασυναγωγός*. The public discussion was principally upon the validity of Presbyterian orders, and while defending it on scriptural and other grounds, Philip Henry could not resist incidentally putting in an argument, in justification of himself and others who had taken Presbyterian and not Episcopal orders, of certainly a greater practical than scientific force, "There was never a bishop" (he said) "to be found when *I* was ordained."

He never sought publicity for its own sake, and being invited to visit the metropolis, where at the time there was more liberty of preaching, he said, "It is true I am here buried alive, but I am quiet in my grave." But the uneasy fears of the government could not leave him quiet even in his grave, for in July, 1685, he and several other gentlemen and ministers from Lancashire were sent under a guard to Chester Castle, and he was kept close prisoner for three weeks. But it was not a harsh confinement, being in fact a kind of triumphant captivity, and made the occasion of visits, kindnesses and attentions all through; and he often spoke of it, not as a subject of complaint, but thanksgiving; and in a sermon to his family the day after his return home, he specially recounted its many mercies; thus, that it was for no cause—it is guilt that makes the prison; that it was his security in a dangerous time; that he had good company in his sufferings, who prayed and read the Scriptures and discoursed together; that he had health there, not sick and in prison; that he was visited and prayed for by his friends; that he was very cheerful and easy in his spirit, many a time asleep and quiet when his adversaries were awake and unquiet; that his enlargement was speedy and unsought for; and that it gave occasion to the magistrates who committed him to give it under their hands that they had nothing in particular to lay to his charge; and, especially, that it was without a snare (i.e. a temptation to make some unworthy compliance for his peace or liberty's sake), which was the thing he feared more than anything else.

This beautiful serenity of mind was accompanied by a most

Christian forgiveness of injuries; for, on James II. (his old play-fellow), to whom he presented and read an address of thanks as he passed through Whitchurch, desiring not only to relieve Nonconformists from, but to compensate them for, their wrongs and sufferings, he was desired to furnish an account of the loss he had suffered in a former distraint upon his goods,—he replied that he should be glad to see such instruments of trouble legally removed, yet he declined to give any further information concerning the wrong done himself (they had carried away thirty-three cart loads of his goods and produce as a distraint for a fine of £40), having long since from his heart forgiven all the agents, instruments and occasions of it, and having purposed never to say anything more of it.

Still it is pleasant that now from 1687, the glorious Revolution of the next year putting the liberties of the nation on still securer foundation, he lived in liberty and enlargement for the remaining nine years of his life. Nevertheless, the conscientious desire which he felt not to interrupt or interfere with the public services of religion in his parish church, made him continue his attendance at Whitewell chapel for two years more (after 1688), and he preached at his own house only when there was no supply there, and in the evening of those days when there was. Of course neither the rigid Separatist nor the strict Churchman liked such a proceeding; so that he said, one side told him he was the author of all the mischief in the country in drawing people *from* the Church; and the other side told him he was the author of all the mischief in the country by drawing people *to* the Church. “And which of these,” asks he, “shall I seek to please? Lord, neither, but Thyself alone, and my own conscience.”

In a sermon at Whitewell chapel one Sunday afternoon, where he and his family and many of his congregation were attending, much was said about the Dissenters being schismatics and in a damnable state. When he came immediately after to preach at his own house, he said, “Perhaps some of you may suppose that I should say something in answer to what we have heard, but truly I have something else to do,” so he went on to preach to them Jesus Christ and him crucified.

However, his hopes were raised by the principles avowed in 1688, that a renewal of some effort after comprehension would now be successful; for no man ever more unwillingly separated himself from the Church of his country and of his fathers than he did. But the thing was impossible; there was no choice between absolute and unqualified submission in every particular, or separation. Those in possession argued that the oaths, subscriptions and ceremonies being imposed for the especial purpose of keeping these men out, they would never consent to their removal for the purpose of letting them in; and that it

was better to have a schism outside the Church than a faction within, not perceiving that there will and must be differences of opinion, and therefore, if we like to call it so, factions, even within the most carefully constructed church, as we find is the case at this very day, notwithstanding all care to the contrary; and that the only result of this refusal of any modification of the terms in conforming is, that now we have three factions in the Church, besides an increased number of schisms without it; and this will continue for ever to be the case, until we learn to call the liberty which is in Jesus Christ by some other names than schism and faction, and until we learn to aim, not at unity in all our forms, in all our phraseology and in all our opinions (which is impossible, and which it is a mere waste of time, peace, temper, and the force which we should all unite to bring against sin and suffering and ignorance, to continue to attempt to effect), and take to aiming at a unity of spirit, with differences of administration, a comprehensive church union and a comprehensive freedom.

Tired of waiting for more liberal things, and agreeing with a brother minister in Lancashire who said that he had been for twenty-seven years trying to please a generation of men who would not be pleased, he would now no longer endeavour it; and the Toleration Act now supplementing the Act of Uniformity, he, like others who agreed with him, established his own church services, turned his barn into a chapel, and became one of the compelled and unwilling founders of English Dissent. Look at the Sunday labours of this man, who never for thirty-six years accepted a farthing's remuneration for his faithful services! At eight o'clock on the Lord's-day he began his morning family worship, reading and expounding the Scriptures, praying and singing. At nine o'clock he began his public service, which lasted till twelve. He then rested about an hour and a half, on sacrament Sundays not so long, and then began the afternoon service of prayer and praise, catechizing and preaching. The evening employments of repeating the substance of the sermons and other offices of instruction and worship closed the day; and certainly we need not wonder that every Sunday night he was wearied with his work—"wearied *with it*," he would say, "but not wearied *of it*."

He was not desirous of publicly baptizing, but was forced as it were into it by the parish minister earnestly cautioning the people (Mr. Henry, his family and many of his friends being present) against going to conventicles, for, said he, "you are baptized into the Church of England." This monopolizing of the great ordinance of baptism was more than he could digest, and he thought it time to bear his testimony against such narrow principles. Accordingly he took the next opportunity that offered itself publicly to baptize a child, and desired the congre-

gation to bear witness "that he did not baptize that child into the Church of England, nor into the Church of Scotland, nor into the Church of the Dissenters, nor into the Church at Broad Oak, but into the visible Catholic Church of Jesus Christ."

Of course now that he was an avowed separatist, against whose privileged liberty, however, the law would allow nothing to be done, the small wit and the small malice of his sillier neighbours were busy against him, and particular mirth arose from the decently fitted-up outer building in which he preached having been a barn; but he met this with a humorous goodnature that did not really mean anything so unkind as the words in another's mouth might have conveyed, "Well, it is better to get wheat in a barn than chaff in a church."*

In addition to his services to his own little society and his own neighbourhood, he gave lectures up and down the country, often returning from them fasting, which he said pleased him better than the contrary extreme, when a great entertainment was made for him. The parish church would sometimes, naturally enough, echo on such occasions to the text, "These men that have turned the world upside down are come hither also." On one occasion, having adjourned the lecture to a new place, which he would do sometimes, to bring it nearer to those who could not travel so far, he took this text himself, and said that the charge in one sense was false, but in another was true; for, said he, "Religion does not disturb the peace of families or societies, or cause any disorder and unquietness; and yet when it comes in power to any soul, it does turn the world upside down in that soul."

After his long and patient expectation of a fair and honourable arrangement with the Church, after his long forbearance and conciliation, finding at length that the thing was not to be, and that the Nonconformists must either at once take and usefully employ a ground of their own, or else altogether die out as an element in English society, English politics and English religion, he took his stand with a decision and an earnestness equal to his previous moderation and retiringness. He brought up his own son, the celebrated Matthew Henry, expressly to this separatist ministry; he took young men into his family, and conducted their studies for the same object; he preached early after its opening at his son's new chapel at Chester; he encouraged everywhere his brethren and their flocks to face and to endure the contumely of the world and the trials of their separatist lot.

Peculiarly sensitive himself to those trials,—peculiarly anxious to live in peace and love with all mankind, himself not liking, but, on the contrary, almost loathing schism, separation and

* The clergyman, however, had at last perhaps the best of the joke, as he is said to have retorted that when people wanted chaff, they were more likely to find it in a barn than in a church.

antagonism in religion on their own account,—personally desirous to take his natural place in society as a scholar, a divine and a gentleman,—he yet never, in compliance with any one of these feelings or all of them united, would consent to violate the sanctity of his own conscience; and he preferred to suffer persecution with those whom he thought to be the people of God, to consenting without remonstrance to see liberty trampled upon, religion injured, or good men oppressed. And though a large portion of his descendants have now, on the one hand, conformed as laymen to the Church, and a large portion, on the other, followed out his principles into theological results which he could not himself have anticipated or at that time at least approved, I do not know that one man living (and there are now thousands) has gone up before the Holy Spirit and declared that he could give his hearty and entire assent to everything contained in the Book of Common Prayer, Creeds and Articles included; and if there ever should be one, I can only form for him this wish, that he will make that declaration after as serious a deliberation and with as entire a sincerity and honesty as his ancestor declined to make it.

And now the end approaches. In the labours I have described, both at home and abroad, for his family, for his neighbourhood and for the Church of Christ, he spent the latter years of his life. But he used to complain in them of an habitual weariness, contracted, he thought, by his standing to preach, sometimes very uneasily and in inconvenient places, after riding. “Every minister” (in relation to these hardships, he would say) “is not cut out for an itinerant.” A few months before his death, he wrote to an anxiously inquiring friend, “I am always habitually weary, and expect no other till I lie down in the grave.” On Tuesday morning, June 23rd, 1695, when he was in his 65th year, he rose at six, conducted his family worship between seven and eight, expounding and singing and praying, went up into his bed-room, became painfully ill, and in sixteen hours was dead. “Son,” said he, as Matthew Henry, who had been sent for from Chester, sat under his dying father’s head—“Son, the Lord bless you, and grant that you may do worthily in your generation, and be more serviceable to the Church of God than I have been.” “Make little ado about me,” he had said; “a few will serve to bring me to the grave.” But a multitude of mourners came from all the neighbouring towns and villages, unsought, not to fill their eyes, as was said, but to empty them, nor was there any other noise there but general lamentation. Many bore witness that day to the good he had done in Israel, and some said he was a man that no one did or could speak evil of, except for his Non-conformity.

He had been peculiarly happy in his family. His children

were all suitably and happily settled in life not far from him, devout and religious themselves and affectionately attached to one another. His only grandson, Matthew Henry's only son, took his mother's name of Warburton, sat in Parliament for the city of Chester, and dying without issue, no survivor of his name was left. His admirable and devoted wife survived him at Broad Oak many years.

Though all the churches—Whitchurch, Worthenbury and Whitewell—in which he worshiped have been pulled down and rebuilt,—though the house in which he passed so large a portion of his simple and beautiful life has been removed,—though the barn-chapel has passed away in the progress of improvements,—though the Broad Oak, round which himself and wife and children would sometimes join hands, and encircle in a proud and cheerful embrace the girth that required so many larger and lesser arms to measure it, has long ago been felled to the ground,—yet there in the old Whitchurch graveyard lie his unmarked remains, a tablet in the church itself alone declaring that they are there. There in the little chapel of Whitewell is the marble tablet that speaks, in the exquisite Latinity of Dr. Tylston, his son-in-law and beloved physician, the love, the sorrow and the consolations of his survivors. There in the little farm-house that has succeeded his dwelling do successive tenants still preserve and shew the pulpit cushion from which he preached, and prize it as part of their succession. There in the immediate neighbourhood rise the modest mansions of some of his descendants, who hold and still seem to watch over his memory and his land. There in the Rectory drawing-room of Worthenbury does a Puleston still point out with honourable taste and pride the portion that constituted the good man's study. There you may still see his parish registry, the years of his office being distinguished from those that preceded and those that succeeded by the conscientious carefulness and exactness of the entries and the beauty of his penmanship. And there, too, the villagers still from time to time present their children at the baptismal font to the present Rector to be christened Philip Henry.

Servant of God, well done!
Rest from thy loved employ;
The battle fought, the victory won,
Enter thy Master's joy.

COVETOUSNESS.

SOUTH says in one of his sermons that covetousness is the first vice in corrupt natures which moves and the last which dies, and that there are more instances of such as riches have made covetous than of such as covetousness has made rich.

ADDRESS AT THE OPENING OF THE SESSION OF MANCHESTER
NEW COLLEGE, LONDON, OCTOBER 13, 1862.

BY REV. JAMES MARTINEAU.

THE act of finality which, two hundred years ago, shut up the future for the Church of England, opened it for the exiles whom it flung upon the world. The Nonconformists, discharged from their ecclesiastical allegiance, had to break with the past; and, like colonists landed on an untrodden shore, to trace the lines of their own spiritual commonwealth, to plant its fields with such seed of promise as they had, and build, according to their own ideal, their city of God. Driven from the settled territory of tradition and usage, they were sent forth as explorers of new possibilities beyond the beaten track of experience. The National Church, relinquishing to them all untried forms of religious faith and life, proclaimed for herself, "Here I take my stand and keep the trust committed to me; I guard the eternal truth, for which there is no movement, but only rest." And certainly there is something majestic in the quiet persistency of her witness to divine things, something that seems to represent their own unchangeableness. Day by day in her cathedrals, week by week in her parish churches, her prayer, her penitence, her hope, have poured themselves forth in the same words; meditation has paced the same annual round of lessons from holy writ; all faces have turned to the east at the same signal, and all lips repeated the same symbols of ancient faith;—expressing by a sublime monotony the repose of a patient piety, and testifying to those constancies in religion which are "the same yesterday, to-day and for ever." And it is a venerable office thus to compel the present to hear the voices of the past and meet them with some reverent sympathy; to qualify the dialect of the hour with the grave speech of an elder time; and through each season's deciduous crop of thought and feeling, to shew the permanent stem and the everlasting root of faith. In proportion as the changes of the world are rapid, and its young spirit grows audacious and intense, do we need to be recalled to the ground of all vicissitude, and made to feel the filiation of our humanity. Still this is but half the duty of a church. However immutable the objects of faith, man, the believing subject, changes from age to age: the range of his knowledge, the meaning of his words, the colouring of his thought, are affected by every accession to science and every new character which genius impresses upon literature; and it is impossible that through all this the same representations of divine things should remain congenial to him, and retain at last the adequacy they had at first. And when we remember what the two centuries have been that expire this year; that they include the whole history of the European academies of science,

and the lives of Newton, Davy, Cuvier and Humboldt; that among their products were the system of Locke, the scepticism of Hume, the critical philosophy of Kant; that they have enriched the shelves of the divine with the works of Cudworth and Butler, of Lardner and Priestley, of Schleiermacher, Neander and Ewald, to say nothing of Strauss and Baur; that they have kept the minds of men awake with vast political revolutions, fertile in temporary wars, but more fertile in the lasting arts of peace; that besides widening the general commonwealth of knowledge, they have given birth to national literatures singularly rich and free;—we must own it impossible that, with nature, history, life, so much expanded, the scope of religious conception should remain unchanged. The language of the elder theology respecting the creation of the heavens and the earth, the origin and the fall of man, the beginning and the end of death and sin, was indigenous to a lesser world than ours, and has a strange and childish sound in a universe opened by the telescope, on an earth interpreted by the geologist, and in face of what we now see of the great drama of human growth and civilization. Without some provision for discharging from its terms what is perishable and obsolete, and permitting its indestructible truth to live into new forms, no church can permanently meet the conditions of human life, but, while affecting to represent the eternal counsel of God, will slip away from the unresting intellect and affections of men. That the ecclesiastical constitution of this country contains no such provision, and pretends not only to uniformity but to perpetuity of doctrine, is placed beyond doubt by a recent judicial decision, in which this memorable statement occurs—that should the progress of knowledge ever so conclusively disprove some affirmation of the established creed, the ordained minister is none the less bound to teach the exploded falsehood and disregard the discovered truth. This clashing between the obligations of personal veracity and the reverence for divine reality is notoriously no hypothetical contingency. In the free air of English life, the clergy cannot be cut off from the influences which circulate through the mental atmosphere of their time, and determine the modes of secular thought and the tone of current literature; and since the whole dogmatic scheme embodied in the symbols of the Church has lost all hold of men of letters and science, since all natural speech which has any living force is quite empty of it, since European culture everywhere goes on apart from it, without even taking the trouble to contradict it, it must be foreign to the very teachers of it, so far as they share the intellectual life of their age. And the struggles of a few foremost spirits among them to realize in fact a latitude denied to them in word, afford suggestions sad enough of sacred doubts that never become light, of noble longings sullenly suppressed, of minds enfeebled by disastrous compromise. It is a

lesson hard to learn, but sure to make itself felt at last, that *a final church foregoes the future.*

It was with an implicit feeling, if not an explicit apprehension of this truth, that the Nonconformists of two centuries ago refused to bind themselves by the conditions proposed for them. They wanted not so much other doctrine as more latitude; not a different uniformity, but a freer variety. Scope for conscience, an open margin for the Spirit of God, a transparent way for fresh light from holy writ, room every way for the soul to turn about and try the paths to God,—this was the meaning of their cry; a meaning which, though hidden from themselves in their day of power, came out more and more clearly with the deeper experiences of natural sorrow and spiritual perplexity. As their complaint against the Church was, not that it was false, but that it was narrow,—so, when they came to provide for the training of successors to their own ministers, their injunction to the learned men entrusted with the task was, not “Teach them *our doctrine*,” but “Teach them *to seek God's truth*.” The several Dissenting academies which preceded our own, founded by men smarting under the demand of subscription to articles of faith, were characterized by a high-minded trust in the issues of growing learning and the native force of sacred truth. They refused to take any security for right belief beyond the pure thirst for light in well-ordered, devout and duly-furnished minds; and charged their tutors with no other duty than to open before the intelligence and conscience of the student the media of divine knowledge, whether in scripture or in the universe, and let the persuasive word pass through. “Shew him where the infinite treasure lies; conduct him to the grand points of contact between the divine and human in this world; give him command of the materials and exercise in the habit of thought; accustom his eye to the lines of spiritual light; and if then he follows not in our path, he may be able to lead us to a better;”—such, in effect, was the inscription on the vestibule of these institutions. This simple faith in nature and scripture as the inexhausted depositories, and in disciplined faculty as the apprehensive organ, of the highest truth, appears to me eminently dignified and noble. In its prospective and hopeful character, it is the natural counterpart of the other religion which only accepts and guards the past, and cannot but carry a different spirit into every department of theological culture. It has always influenced, and must always influence, the whole programme of study, the style of scholarship, the tone of piety, in the schools of learning which it animates. This will readily appear if we spread out before us in their mutual relations the main lines of religious research. I take them in the order, not of their relative importance to us, but of their logical bearing among themselves.

Theology is the doctrine of divine things, and for their true

apprehension the theologian must station himself at the points where they manifestly touch the human and leave their mark within the range of our life and thought. What and where are these?

I. One sphere there is of *immediate* relation between ourselves and God, where the apprehension of Him is first-hand and direct, viz. the sphere of our own mind. We are not made for the cognizance of finite and transient things alone, but have something in us answering to the whole realm of being in which we stand: on the one hand, to the natural world of phenomena; on the other, to the supernatural Reality behind. The structure of our faculties discloses more than we need for a true picture and an accurate reckoning of the physical theatre around, or even for the provident and comfortable ordering of human life; when our outfit for the visible and passing scene has been measured off, there is still a mysterious fund of residuary thought, belief, affection, which, unless it be a delusion and a counterfeit, is the token of the invisible Perfection that is and was and ever will be. No sooner do we exercise any endowment of natural knowledge or momentary energy, than we are flung into mysterious discoveries that transcend experience; behind perception of the finite, Space uncreated and infinite; behind consciousness of succession, a motionless Eternity; behind perishable phenomena, imperishable Power; behind the impulses of affection and the problems of the will, the authority of a living Righteousness; behind the beauty of the world and the graces of pure souls, a light of meaning from the first Fair and the first Good. Strip off where you will the outer folds of intelligence or feeling, and you will find yourself in the presence of essential ideas all infinite, all converging upon a point in the invisible, all functions of an eternal life and thought. Self-knowledge therefore, in whatsoever direction, discloses in the last resort far more than self; and the sciences of self-knowledge, as their line drops deeper and deeper through the nature of man, feel in the end the unfathomable ground and touch the everlasting Rock. Logic, winding its way through the laws of thinking, rests at length at the roots of thought; Æsthetic, after removing the accidents of taste and defining the rules of just admiration and the principles of true Art, feels still a mystery of expressiveness which speaks and cannot be spoken of; Ethics, by simply unfolding the moral sentiments and examining the assumptions of the moral law, are transported beyond the limits of human nature, and brought face to face with an august Holiness. All knowledge of our own mind culminates in the apprehension of God; and I believe it was the sense of this fact that gave so prominent a place, in our old theological academies and literature, to moral, logical and metaphysical pursuits. It was not simply that they afforded a healthy discipline to the understanding; that the analysis of reasoning gave the power of

detecting falsities; that the laws of sensation and suggestion explained away the wonder from all our faculties, and exhibited belief and affection in the weaving; that to have insight into classification was to hold the key of science; that to scrutinize the essence of private right and wrong would make good casuists, and to know the theory of the State and its public law would help to form good citizens. True as all this is, the real interest of these studies lay elsewhere; in the vestiges sought within our humanity of a life more than human; in the suspected signs of a Divine witness to our reason, our conscience, our affections. Were it not for the hope of lifting some corner of the sacred veil, the deeper speculative philosophy, however serviceable as an intellectual gymnastic, would want that highest fascination by which in every age it has drawn to it so many capacious, fervid, meditative minds. But this consecrated charm, this divine thirst, is gone the moment you stereotype the forms of faith and shut up the future possibilities of light. Philosophy must have hope, or it will pine away; you cannot take from its voice the undertone of prayer; its foot must be free if it is to move at all. In churches, therefore, that have passed their acts of finality, its inspiration is extinct; it has no advance to make, no territory to win; as the bondsman of the past, it is permitted only to throw up earthworks of defence to stop the conquering founders of new empires. It needs but little acquaintance with literary history to perceive how prevailingly, under the rule of fixed ecclesiastical systems, a purely negative and critical function has been given to philosophy. At the utmost, leave has been granted it to work up, by some way of its own, to a foregone conclusion, and corroborate the Sacraments from Aristotle or the Trinity from Plato. More frequently it has been deemed dangerous to let both the councils of the church and the courts of philosophy sit under the same roof, with the advocates passing from the one to the other; and the jurisdiction of thought in cases of faith has been denied altogether. Psychology has been called in, but only to testify that we have no faculty of divine apprehension; Logic, but only to disparage its own limits; Metaphysics, but only to demonstrate their incompetency; Ethics, but only to erase the religious value of moral distinctions. This is the last humiliation of philosophy,—to force its own implements into its own hand, that it may bleed itself to death and make the church its heir. If this is all it has to do—to prove that it can do nothing—it must soon be tired and ashamed of life and fly from the ignominy of existence. We may well be thankful that our forerunners escaped this attitude of scepticism towards the religion of Thought. They never dreamed that our humanity could be without any organ of religious knowledge,—constituted just as it might be in an atheistic world. They knew that without a prior Natural religion, no subsequent Revealed was possible, since on mere deaf

incapacity even heavenly voices are thrown away. And by their habitual example and their abstinence from distrustful restraints upon the future, they encouraged the reverential and hopeful resort to human Reason and Conscience, as not only the seats of finite wisdom, but as audience-halls of God.

II. I have spoken of the theology arising in self-knowledge as an *immediate* apprehension of divine truth, in order to mark it off from religion that comes to us *through the medium* of some object interposed between ourselves and God, whether it be the visible frame of Nature or the persons and events of History. Is it a mysticism or an enthusiasm to refer thus to a faith direct and intuitive, as distinguished from one indirect and logical? All that I mean is this,—that if, with your powers opened and matured, you were in solitude with God,—with no presence of the world or of the crowd of men,—you would not be without cognizance of Him; you would find, in what you had to think and feel, traces of something other and higher than self, and would not be forced into the delusive egotism of supposing you were all in all. To deny this is to say that there are no “foot-prints of the Creator” in the human mind; or that while He leaves his mark on all gradations of creatures, the very being who is most expressly in his image is driven to the lower signs of his reality. This would be a strange result of the similitude, in the common element of spirituality, between his nature and ours,—that Living God and living Man should be ever in presence of each other, yet have no concerns together, no meeting-points of possible recognition, no gleam from the eternal perfectness mingling with the broken lights of human aspiration. If the language of our conscious spirits is all secular, the universe has for us no voices that are divine.

Man, however, would never know what he is, or even *be* what he is, were he suspended in loneliness, however sacred. For the training and evolution of his powers, for the awakening of his latent life, and therefore for his self-knowledge as well as for other knowledge, he needs the scene and society around him. The phenomena of his inner experience, when found, furnish him with a theology; but to find them, he must have also an outer experience, and belong to a world open to his intellect, and a human history that is the multiplying mirror of himself. Set thus in presence of objects related to his faculties and divinely constituted no less, he finds in them *mediate* sources of religion: of *natural* religion, so far as it flows in upon him from the spectacle of the universe: of *historical* religion, so far as it enters by the path of personal sympathy and reverence, and owns the manifestations of God in the spiritual records of humanity.

1. Of these two media of divine knowledge, *Nature*, the great source of Pagan religion, has been characteristically subordinated, not to say neglected, in Christendom. All the leading concep-

tions of the Christian faith are moral and personal, not kosmical; they arise out of the *direct* relation of the human spirit to the Divine, and would not be much affected though the world were removed out of the way. In the problems of sin and holiness, of ruin and redemption, of estrangement and reconciliation, sun and stars, equator and ecliptic, have nothing to do: composition of water, and speed of light, and laws of crystallization, are irrelevant accidents; the rocks might have a different succession, and the flora and fauna of every zone might be changed, without touching the result. From this neutral attitude of physical phenomena towards Christian ideas, it might seem to follow, that the theologian had no interest, either way, for or against the researches of men of science; that their whole intellectual field was foreign to him, and therefore equally safe from his interference, whether his system were shut or open. In this case, as there would be no affinity, so there would be no clashing, between religion and science: and on this basis accordingly many a treaty of peace has been concluded between divines who cannot keep their eye off nature, and *savans* who will give anything for a quiet life. In effect, however, the rule supplies but a hollow truce which it is impossible to keep. The divine, entrenched behind the written word of God, may give up all natural Theism, and let the study of nature pass free as a mere secular pursuit: but he soon discovers that, if it cannot establish natural religion, it can contradict what he had reserved as revealed; and is angry at the breach of understanding, by which the instruments of discovery and peaceful art are turned against him as weapons of war. Must we not tell him, it is his own fault? Is he not himself the first offender, in taking more than he could fairly claim into his reserved field? Did he not label a good many scientific propositions with the name "Revealed Religion," and carry them off into his sacred enclosure? and can he be offended if they are re-captured and perhaps destroyed? That the universe was created in six days, the earth as the chief thing, and the starry heavens as its decorated roof; that the human race are descended from one pair, of whose lapse Death and Sin are the perpetual entail; that, in redemption of this entail, a divine person, born of a woman, assumed our humanity, confronted the spirits of evil, and drove them from the minds and bodies they had possessed, and carried off the general curse by his own sacrifice;—these are samples of doctrinal assertion that variously trench on the domain of natural knowledge, and must be amenable to its scrutiny. A church which is committed to them has already thrown down the gauntlet to science, and instinctively looks for an adversary in every calm advance of discovery or sudden rush of genius. The only escape from this humiliating fear is in an unpledged theology, accessible to all variations of phenomenal knowledge, and consecrating nothing

as "revealed" but those moral and spiritual truths whose range is beyond the reach of induction, which no telescope can interpret into meteors, no analysis precipitate as dust. But this is not all. Besides the negative relief from fear, a positive trust that greater conceptions must dawn upon us ensues from an open faith: the indifference to science as merely secular, and its discharge from all higher obligations, are recalled: Nature, no longer suspected of being against us, is re-consecrated as the handiwork of God; and a reverent curiosity seeks for true links of thought by which to connect the divine order of the outer world with the divine inner laws of our humanity. Precisely and only in proportion as the intellect has been released from the restraints of a fixed dogmatic system, has the interest in natural religion deepened, and the foresight of science been found compatible with the insight of faith. Care for natural religion is the constant attendant on breadth of Christian faith. It needed some latitude of thought in Newton to stand upon the confines of the new universe he had found, and find its relation to Him whose duration (to use the Philosopher's own solemn words) "reaches from eternity to eternity; whose presence from infinity to infinity; who governs all things, and knows all things that are or can be done:"* in Clarke to construct, in Butler to criticise, the Theistic interpretation of space and time: in Priestley to blend into one whole the discoveries of the chemist and the meditations of the divine. Wherever the relations are deeply pondered between the method of physical and that of religious knowledge, not for the sake of severing them by any impassable chasm, but in the hope of bringing them to unity, depend upon it you are in presence of a liberal school or a liberal age. The noble wonder of the intellect, which still sighs and seeks for a "First Philosophy" able, with the two eyes of faith and science, to make the double picture one, can live only in men and churches that have something to learn. If any sacredness is to invest natural knowledge, if it is to be more than the outfit for a profession, the source of material power, and the occasion of mean competition in the race of ideas, it will owe it to the few whose worship as well as science is touched with hope, and expects from the brightest meridian of knowledge the richest vesper glow of prayer.

2. The great medium, however, of divine contact with our world is not, after all, the physical Kosmos, that speaks God's power and the method of his thought, but the constitution and course of human history, which are the organs of his communicated character and will. Clear traces of himself he has doubtless impressed on the individual soul. But individuality itself is not formed except in society and by long inheritance of time; it

* Principia, the concluding Scholium.

is the last product of rich and various culture; and the philosopher or worshiper of to-day is an epitome of all the ages. The lives of other men, their spoken admiration, their acted grief and passion, the stature of their higher nobleness, touch us with more than sympathy, and are the great means of shewing us what we are, and lifting us towards what we are not yet. Biography, history, and language,—that wonderful crystallization of the very flow and spray of thought,—constitute an objective self-knowledge, and, by a thousand affinities, draw out into clearer light whatever our nature holds of authoritative and divine. If men have never and nowhere been left alone by their Heavenly Guide, if his mystery has always mingled with their life, ancient and foreign literature can in no case be quite profane, but in their artless expressions of wonder, love and pity, must appeal to some pieties in us; and even where no religious end is directly in view, a wide and scholarly familiarity with the words and ways of other times, with their special types of character, with the tone of their poetry and the temper of their laws, indirectly generates an atmosphere of humane and considerate sympathy, the proper climate of justice and veneration. It is not, however, till we address ourselves to men's conscious thought about divine things, their efforts to pass behind the veil of the visible world and read the secrets there, that we begin to glean and count the scattered elements of sacred truth on which the higher trusts of humanity have lived. The time is past when faiths and philosophies foreign to our own were studied merely to contrast their darkness with our light, and make the chasm absolute all round our solitary island of exclusive revelation. We begin to see that they were the noble efforts of a reason never wholly baffled, a conscience never quite asleep, and became the depositories of partial truth, till the stream of "living water" could take up the confluent tributaries and fill the river of life. In this thought we gain, for the first time, the key of interpretation for what is alien to our experience. Antipathy understands nothing; and not till the theologian looks on Christendom as the last stage in the providential evolution and inspiration of humanity, related to all that goes before, will he apprehend either what lies within or what lies beyond his own faith. But once let him seize this point of view, and then the attempt to master systems of thought belonging to another intellectual latitude will afford him the finest discipline of understanding and sympathy; and while imparting a catholic breadth of aspiration for what is distant from him, will leave the keenest sense of the distinctive sanctities that abide with him at home. To a wide knowledge and thoughtful estimate of the past we must look as the only real safeguard against the passing caprices of sceptic or fanatic thought. Churches that have no trust take securities from their clergy, and bind them to the forms of distant centuries; but what they gain in persistency they lose in life. On the other hand, the mere practical man of

to-day, nurtured on the current literature and touched with the newest zeal, goes into utter captivity to the humour of the hour; and if he seems to lead others, does so by the levity of his nature, carrying him ahead of them down any stream of tendency that may have the swiftest flow. In the minister of sacred things, who represents before men the constancies of eternal truth and righteousness, this helpless mobility is a humiliating spectacle, secretly despised amid the noisiest applause. We expect from him a spirit lifted above the fitful temperature that alternately strains or relaxes the chords of more dependent minds; and we shall expect in vain, unless we help him to an intellectual eminence above surprise, whence the great movements of humanity can be watched with the quick eye of Pity and of Trust, and the distant voices of its prayer and strife can meet the ear.

It must needs be, however, that the history and literature of paramount interest for us are those which convey to us and embody our own faith. The sacred records of the Hebrew race, and the primitive memorials of the Christian revelation, must ever form the main objects of the theologian's study, the spring of his inspiration, the source of his teaching. Other ignorances of his may be deplorable; but ignorance of these is simply disqualifying. The languages in which they were written, the origin of their constituent books, the history of their text, the comparison of their versions, the interpretation of their contents, have been treated so copiously since the Reformation, as to create a vast apparatus of sacred learning, itself the material of no little subsidiary scholarship; but the topics are worthy of it all. True, the keenness and minuteness of biblical research may have arisen from a too narrow and rigorous conception of the Word of God,—from an acceptance of the Scriptures as throughout a kind of divine legal instrument, which criticism had only to construe and piety to obey. If so, however, it needs a still larger and more searching erudition to undo the effects of this error, and to resolve the false documentary monotony into the variegated lights, divine and human, the distinctive colourings of person, place and time, that make the difference felt between the dead letter of a bequest and the living spirit of a sacred history. In truth, the genuine grounds of theological defence for biblical learning are far stronger than any fiction of which they take the place. If in the Scriptures we had one uniform charter, any part of which might be used in explanation of any other, its meaning would open to the key of a simply grammatical and textual criticism, and the scholarly divine would be a mere competent translator and annotator. But if the interest of the writings consists in this, that while they constitute a purely human literature, they tell the story, and confess the sins, and breathe the devotion, of a people most susceptible of the prophetic inspiration and most conscious of their divine Guide,—that, further, they present to us, as the consummate flower of this growing

and refining life, the transcendent personality of Jesus, in whom the power of the Spirit took up humanity entirely and shewed it to be immortal, yet draw this picture with touches various and rude, not in its absolute reality, but in its relative impression upon differing and wondering minds;—then, although the essence of their truth may speak for itself to the sound in reason and the pure in heart, yet rightly to disengage it from its envelopments, without either giving them its authority or throwing them away, is a work far beyond the reach of the mere grammarian and translator,—a work of historical reconstruction, in which there is use for the amplest materials of learning, commanded by force of imagination and cultivated sympathy. The large combinations of modern historical criticism bring with them, no doubt, their speculative temptations; but no one can doubt that they are the fruit of not less erudition and of greater genius than the annotative scholarship of rigid schools and of an earlier time.

It only remains for me, in conclusion, to recite,—as I do with heartfelt satisfaction,—the creditable results to the students under our care, of the last award of class distinctions in University College. In the senior Greek class, the first prize was gained by Mr. Joseph Estlin Carpenter; while Mr. J. Edwin Odgers received the third certificate, Mr. John S. Ainsworth the sixth: and in the junior Greek class, the fourth certificate was awarded to Mr. Philip H. Wicksteed. In the senior Latin, Mr. J. Edwin Odgers obtained the first prize; the fifth certificate was doubly awarded to two equal competitors, both of whom it is a pleasure to mention in such association, Mr. Lindsey M. Aspland and Mr. J. Estlin Carpenter; and similarly the eighth certificate was given twice, in fraternal partnership to Mr. David Ainsworth and Mr. John S. Ainsworth, sons of the President of Manchester New College; the tenth to Mr. R. Acland Armstrong: while in the junior Latin, Mr. P. H. Wicksteed received the fourth certificate. In the lower senior Mathematics, the prize was awarded to Mr. J. Estlin Carpenter; the sixth certificate to Mr. John S. Ainsworth. In the higher junior Mathematics, Mr. Richard A. Armstrong and Mr. P. H. Wicksteed both received a fifth certificate: and in the lower junior, Mr. Alexander M'Giffin received a third certificate. In Professor Masson's English Literature class, an extra certificate was awarded to Mr. Richard A. Armstrong. And in Professor Beesly's Ancient History class, Mr. J. E. Odgers received the prize. If anything is needed to complete our gratification at these instances of recognized diligence and success, we have it on finding that they stand side by side in a list of honours which includes the names of Busk, Venning, Kitson, Schwabe, Darbishire, Greg and Osler. May this association in the generous emulations of the academic class-room be the augury of a future fellowship in all that is manly, honourable and true, on the larger field of civil and ecclesiastic life!

NOTES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Exodus i. 8: "And there arose a new king over Lower Egypt, who knew not Joseph."

The word Mitzraim very rarely, indeed never, except perhaps in the later books, includes both Upper and Lower Egypt. The two people had up to the time of Moses been two nations, unlike in much of their religion and in many of their customs, and speaking dialects which were by no means the same. When the whole of Egypt is spoken of, the two countries are both named; thus Jeremiah calls them Mitzraim and Pathros, chap. xlv. 15: "all the people that dwelt in the land of Mitzraim [or Lower Egypt] and in Pathros [or Upper Egypt]."

This correction should, I conceive, be made in every passage in the Old Testament.

Exodus xiv. 7: "And he took six hundred chosen chariots, and all the chariots of Lower Egypt, and three men in each;" or more literally, "a third fighting man in each."

The Egyptian sculptures on the walls of their temples shew us sometimes two and sometimes three men in each of the war-chariots. When there are three, one holds the reins, one holds a shield, and one strikes with a spear. As the king had six hundred chariots, which did not belong to Lower Egypt, we may suppose that he brought them from Upper Egypt, as the two countries were at this time under one monarch.

Genesis xliii. 11: "Carry down to the man a present, a little balsam, and a little sweetmeat, spices and ladanum, nuts and almonds."

The sweetmeat of preserved grapes is even at the present time called by the same name, *dibish*, as it was when Jacob sent it to Pharaoh. The honey of the Authorized Version would have been no rarity in Egypt.

Genesis xxxvii. 3: "For Israel loved Joseph more than all his children, because he was the son of his old age; and he made him a coat with long sleeves."

Such, according to our best scholars, should be the rendering, in the place of the Authorized "coat of many colours."

Genesis xlix. 10: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until he come to Shiloh; and to him shall the people be obedient."

The town of Shiloh had been the priestly capital before the Israelites had gained possession of Jerusalem. The Authorized Version has, "until Shiloh come," making Shiloh into a person. The preposition "to" is wanting in the Hebrew, and hence the

difficulty. But it may be explained by a second passage, in which the Authorized Version equally needs correction. In Ezekiel xxix. 10, Egypt is described as reaching "from Migdol to Syene, even to the borders of Ethiopia." Here, as above, the preposition "to" is wanting in the Hebrew, and hence the Authorized writes, "from the tower of Syene." But in both places the absent preposition may and ought to be supplied. It is a single vowel, postfixed to the name of the place, but here omitted because the names of these two places both end with that very vowel.

Numbers xxxiv. 5: "And the boundary shall turn from Azmon unto the Nile of Egypt, and its termination shall be at the sea."

In opposing this rendering, our critics remark, 1st, that the Hebrew word Nile means a valley, a torrent, a small brook, and not a large river, and therefore it cannot mean the river Nile, which in other places in the Bible is called the Sihor; and, 2ndly, that the boundary of Judea did not reach to the Nile, but only to a small brook or torrent in the desert, dry in hot weather. In answer to these objections, I remark, that the Hebrew knowledge of the river Nile was very much confined to the Pelusiatic branch, which was a very shallow, unimportant stream,—that that branch might very naturally have had a name for itself, which would of course be a word denoting a smaller river than either the Sihor or the Euphrates. I further remark that the Jewish power did sometimes reach to the Pelusiatic stream. In 1 Sam. xv., Saul conquers the Amalekites, and is master of the intermediate country between Judea and Egypt, up to the very walls of Pelusium or Shur. Hence it was perfectly natural that the Jews should at all times claim to be masters of the desert belonging to the Amalekites, and to have the Pelusiatic stream as the boundary of their kingdom. No name could be given to this shallow branch more suitable than the Nile, or *stream*, of Lower Egypt. Hence I would in every place use the Hebrew words, "the Nile of Egypt," when the stream at the boundary of Judea is spoken of, and utterly reject the notion of our geographers that an unknown torrent in the desert was meant by those words.

Exodus xxxiv. 6, 7: "A God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, but abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands; bearing with iniquity and transgression and sin, but by no means wholly forgiving, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, to the third and to the fourth generation."

The Authorized Version has, "forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin," which makes nonsense of what follows, and does violence to the Hebrew. The only words of any difficulty are in the Hebrew, "when forgiving not forgiving," which the

Authorized renders, "that will by no means clear *the guilty*," but which I would render, "by no means wholly forgiving."

Numbers xxiv. 21: "Strong is thy dwelling-place, and thou puttest thy nest in the Rock [Selah or Petra]; nevertheless the Kenite shall be destroyed."

When these lines were written, the rock-city of Petra was held by the Kenites. It is here, and in many other places, only by a double translation that the full meaning of the original can be shewn.

Deut. vi. 4: "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah is our God, Jehovah alone."

The Authorized Version follows the LXX. in saying, "our God is one Lord," meaning an undivided Lord. But it was only in very late days that any such refinements as plurality in unity had entered into the minds of theologians. The words in Deuteronomy were meant to contradict polytheism, but not the later notions of the Ogdoad, or the Trinity.

Numbers xxxiii. 7, 8: "And they removed from Etham, and stopped at the Bay of Hahiroth which is before Baal-zephon, and they encamped before Migdol. And they removed from Hahiroth, and passed through the midst of the sea into the desert."

The town of Hahiroth is the Heroopolis of the Roman Itinerary, and it gave its name to the bay at the western head of the Red Sea. In Leviticus xxv. 18, the same words are correctly translated *dwelt in*, which we render *stopped at*. The Hebrew gives no support to the "*turned again to Pi-hahiroth*" of the Authorized Version, which would make the fugitives almost turn back, or at least turn a second time.

S. S.

SIR JOHN BOWRING ON THE STATE OF RELIGION IN HOLLAND.

THE position of religious inquiry in Holland is characteristic of the age. Theological discussion of a very decided and sometimes of an intemperate character has succeeded to a long-during indifference. The Groningen school, as it is called, whose opinions are nearly allied to those of English Unitarians, took the lead in a controversy which now agitates most of the Dutch churches. There is a singular habit in the great cities of the Netherlands. On Saturdays a list is circulated of the names and subjects of the sermons of all the preachers who are to occupy the different pulpits on the following day; and as they are not necessarily located in a particular church, the congregations constantly vary, but at the same time their greater or less number represents the greater or less popularity of the minister. At

Amsterdam I went to the most crowded of the churches; and but for the circumstance of being in the company of a member of the States' Council, to whom the higher seats or tribunes are reserved, it would have been difficult to make our way through the immense crowd of listeners who occupied every seat, and in fact left no standing-room in the aisles or entries. This preacher (Mr. L.) keeps wholly aloof from the bitter disputations of the day. He is eloquent even to passion, and produced so strong an effect on the audience—he so obviously moved and agitated them—that I almost expected the solemn silence would have been succeeded by an explosive *Bravo!* The sermon was altogether of a practical character. The text was, "Thou shalt not steal." He drew some touching pictures of the first seductions by which youth is led astray. He pleaded for pity, for charity, towards the unfortunate whom want and woe have tempted into crime. He conducted us to the prison and the judgment-seat, to the privations of good, to the presence of evil, to the pains and penalties which the law-breakers bring upon themselves, and all the distress and disorder which accompany a career of guilt. And then he dealt with the more exalted criminals who escape the castigation of the judge and the control of the legislator. He drew a succession of pictures of sinners of omission and commission, and at the end of every life-portrait exclaimed, "And he too is a thief!" The prodigal, the miser, the promise-breaker, the drunkard, the egotist, the idler, the hypocrite, the perjurer, the pharisee, the persecutor—each, every one, "a thief," robbing himself, robbing society, of that which he had no right to steal. He had been invited to several of the principal cities of Holland, and on coming to Amsterdam he declared that he would not involve himself in the vexed questions which disturbed the peace of the church. "I find men," he said, "struggling in doubts and in darkness; the less clearly they see their way, the more they are entangled in mists and mysteries, the more angry they become with one another. Into such obscurity I do not mean to guide you. You must come with me into the bright sunshine and into the fresh air. You must walk about with untrammelled limbs and admire what is beautiful and divine." The preaching was made more interesting by the baptism in the middle of the service of no less than twenty-five children, whose parents were addressed from the pulpit, whence the preacher descended to perform the ceremony by sprinkling each of the infants in turn.

In the morning I had heard a specimen of ordinary orthodox intolerance, in the genuine spirit of the Athanasian Creed. Damnation upon damnation for all unbelievers—"washing in blood," or inevitable everlasting agonies—worthlessness of works—*faith* the only ground of salvation.

I found that Dr. Channing's writings have made a deep impression upon the Hollanders. The translation of them is excellent,

and Channing's language is rendered into most emphatic Dutch. Theodore Parker is also well known, much studied and much admired.

The Theistic, or, as it is here called, the School of the New Theology, has now many avowed advocates. The truth of the miracles, alike of the New and the Old Testament, is doubted, impugned and openly denied in some of the Dutch churches. The opposition to free discussion, I am sorry to say, often takes a most uncharitable and unchristian form. The head of orthodoxy was till his death a converted Jew, Da Costa; but now Groen van Prensteren, who was the Secretary of King William the First, stands forth as the acknowledged leader of the High Evangelical party. At some future time I hope to give you an account of the more remarkable books which exhibit the present state of religious opinion in the Low Countries.

The Hague, Oct. 17, 1862.

VISIT TO AMSTERDAM. BY LADY BOWRING.

OF Amsterdam, strange pictures haunt my mind ;
 And ever present to my inward sight,
 I view canals o'erhung with houses quaint,
 Windmills and lofty buildings interspersed,
 And locks and bridges spanning yellow floods,
 While busy life hums in the barge and street.
 Anon I dream of gardens—beasts and birds
 From foreign climes, how varied and how grand !
 But human interests hold still deeper sway.
 Joyful I learn that kindly hearts here beat,
 That friendly hands are stretched to raise, to guide,
 The poor and lowly in God's heavenly way ;
 That babes through flowery paths are led to taste
 The pleasures that the tree of knowledge yields.
 Twelve hundred happy faces,* what a sight !
 The blended voices which harmonious swelled,
 Singing in measured cadence stranger words,
 Touched deep our sympathies. For kindred souls,
 Breathing in unison from various lands,
 Oft utter forth a sound that overpowers
 The forms of speech which differing nations use,
 And mount in prayerful chorus to the skies.
 Oh ! may the intercourse of coming years
 Such generous beings to one spirit mould,
 And so their thoughts and hopes and business blend,
 That each to each be counsellor and friend !

The Hague, Oct. 14, 1862.

* In one of the schools we visited there were more than that number of children.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A CRY FOR HELP FROM DUKINFIELD.

SIR,

I AM happy to inform you that your kind notice of our suffering township in the October No. has produced very satisfactory results. You will see from the appended list that I have received some very generous donations of money and valuable parcels of materials and clothing. Nearly £50 of the money has been expended in clogs and boots, enabling many house-bound young women to attend the sewing classes, and many lads to resume their places in the schools.

I stated in my last that Dukinfield was worse off than the neighbouring districts. Our population, I stated, was 16,000, of whom rather more than 6000 were usually employed in the various works and in coal-mines. To these must be added a great many families out of work residing with us and dependent upon us, but really belonging to neighbouring places. In prosperous times the colliers of Dukinfield number more than 1200; of these, 350 are now on tramp in search of work, and have left their families dependent upon charity. Of these 6000 working in Dukinfield, 610 only are fully employed, 1765 are working short time, and the greater proportion of these will have in a week or two to be added to the sad list of "out of work." When this is accomplished, the loss of industrial earnings will not be less than between £3000 and £4000 weekly. The Guardians are by no means lavish, giving $13\frac{1}{4}d.$ weekly to each applicant. Our Relief Committee and private charities furnish about £290.

Compare this with Hyde, our immediate neighbour. It has a population of rather more than 17,000, of whom 1030 are working full time. It has several hundreds less than Dukinfield out of work, and they distribute weekly through their Relief Committee and from private sources more than £600.

With our immediate neighbours Ashton and Stalybridge we compare still more unfavourably in our labour list; but not having the figures at hand, I abstain from enumeration. Our Savings' Bank at the Post-office, Stalybridge, began its financial year 1860 with an increase of deposits of more than £10,000 over the preceding year; it will close this year with a diminished balance of £20,000.

Our poor's-rate, according to our present expenditure, is going on at not less than 10s. 6d. in the pound, and must of necessity increase. The Manchester Committee distribute their funds on a scheme based on the amount of local subscriptions, and we are only entitled, according to their calculations, to £350 per month. I should, however, state that, at our urgent solicitations, they granted us £500 at their last sitting. Thanks to the Lord Mayor, we have not yet been obliged to turn a deaf ear to destitute applicants; but we shall next week be expending at the rate of £1000 per month, and we cannot at present see the source of supply. The purchase of clothing by the recipients of two shillings or half-a-crown a week (and many have less) is of course out of the question. The winter is approaching, and we shall need all that our friends at a distance can supply to us. You, Sir, from your knowledge of this district, are aware of the high respectability and proud indepen-

dence of the overlookers in the factories. You know how liberally they contribute in ordinary times in support of religious and educational institutions; and it would have grieved you to see this week not a few of this class applying for clogs. We are very fortunate in having at the head of our police an officer of a very humane disposition. Knowing nearly everybody, Sergeant Buckley is enabled to send me the names of the most deserving and distressed. The most deserving and most distressed shut themselves up in their comfortless homes and have to be sought out. The indefatigable labours of Sergeant Buckley are peculiarly beneficial to this class, and save us from being victimised by hereditary paupers and the able-bodied vagabondage of the district. I have been enabled, through the kindness of a lady residing at a distance, to send six poor children to a school where they are provided with everything and instructed. I should like to mention this benevolent lady's name, but not having asked her permission I do not feel at liberty to publish it; but I may add that this is not the only mode in which she has afforded very material help to our suffering poor.

Before concluding, I may mention that we buy all our clogs in the village, and are enabled to obtain them at wholesale prices. Mr. Bass has given several hundred pairs of clogs, and distributes about twelve hundred weight of bread weekly. He is the life and soul of our Relief Committee. I regret to have to state that the Board of Guardians have, notwithstanding their implied promise to the contrary, struck off from their relief list the young women employed in sewing classes, and who receive half-a-crown for five days' work. Their Chairman has in vain urged them to conduct their business with an efficient staff. Their object seems to be to repel the poor, and to treat this exceptional calamity as ordinary pauperism, resulting from incapacity or misconduct.

I remain yours gratefully,

Dukinfield, Oct. 24, 1862.

ALFRED ASPLAND.

List of Subscriptions and Donations.

R. K. Lumb, Esq., Cheltenham	£10	0	0
Mrs. Lumb	5	0	0
James Worthington, Esq., Manchester	5	0	0
Charles W. Potts, Esq., Chester	5	0	0
Michael Harris, Esq., Hackney	5	0	0
The Misses Yates, the Dingle, Liverpool.....	10	0	0
Collected by Mary and Eliza Kirby, Penton Place, London	0	3	9
Miss Thornton, Birmingham	1	0	0
William Brodhurst, Esq., the Friary, Newark	5	0	0
Captain Lee Jackson, Madras Army, per Miss Lee, Topsham ...	2	0	0
A. S. Aspland, Esq., Highbury	5	0	0
Samuel Sharpe, Esq., ditto	5	0	0
Mrs. Wallace, Evesham	1	0	0
The Miss Hampsons, ditto	5	0	0
A Friend, per R. D. Darbshire, Esq., Manchester	10	0	0
Mrs. Yorstoun, Allanton, Dumfries, per Robert Stuart, Esq. ...	50	0	0
Henry Ridge, Esq., Clapton.....	5	5	0
Miss Ridge.....	1	1	0
Mrs. Joseph Wright, Brighton.....	1	0	0
Mr. Edward Wright, London	1	0	0
William Johnston, Esq., Clapton.....	1	0	0
Mr. Charles Green, Hackney	1	0	0
Mr. Barrow and Family, ditto.....	1	0	0
Mr. Dean, Bow	0	8	0
Rev. R. Brook Aspland	5	0	0

Jesse Middleton, Esq., Burton Crescent	£5	0	0
Miss S. E. Thornton, the Elms, Camp Hill, Birmingham	0	10	0
Rev. J. C. W. Ells, M.A., Sidney College, Cambridge	1	0	0

Parcels of Clothing and Materials from the undermentioned.

The Hon. Wilbraham Egerton, M.P., Rostherne Hall, Knutsford, a 2nd donation.

Rev. J. H. Ryland, Bradford.

Mrs. Harris, Darnley House, Hackney.

M. B., Dorsetshire.

Miss Lempriere, Brighton.

Mrs. Moseley, Leaton Hall, Stourbridge.

Miss M. Bowen, Stourbridge.

Mrs. James Heywood, Palace Gardens, Kensington.

Mrs. Troup, Essex Lodge, Clapton, a large box and a parcel of new materials and of clothing.

Mr. Beeton, Hackney, a parcel of 41 articles of clothing.

Mrs. Ranne, St. John's Wood, a parcel of clothing and of new materials.

Mr. J. E. Clennell, Hackney, a parcel of clothing.

Mr. Dean, Bow, a parcel of clothing.

Mr. Dalby, Hackney, a parcel of clothing.

Mrs. Aspland, Hackney, a piece of new Welsh flannel.

Miss Ellen Pashley, some new flannel.

The Misses Nisbett, Hackney, a parcel of clothing.

Mr. Barrow, ditto.

Rev. R. B. Aspland, ditto.

Others are kindly promised and will be announced on a future occasion.

Parcels may be transmitted carriage free if sent to R. Machure, Esq., Hon. Sec. Manchester Relief Committee. He will transmit them to their destination as indicated on a corner of the direction card. Mr. A. Aspland, of Dukinfield, will be glad to furnish printed direction labels if friends will apply to him.

THE DISTRESS IN DUKINFIELD.

SIR,

WILL you allow me to say to the readers of the *Christian Reformer* that I shall be most thankful to receive money and clothing for the relief of the suffering poor of Dukinfield. I wish to make this announcement, in addition to the statement on the same subject contained in the last number of your Magazine, because I think that statement, standing alone, may be misunderstood. The poor with whom I am brought into contact consist chiefly of persons connected with my congregation and Sunday-schools, and I am very desirous to have the means of supplying their wants beyond what may be done by the common methods of relief. My congregation have already contributed funds and organized themselves for this purpose; but what has thus been done will only partially meet the existing necessity. The distribution of the money and goods which may be obtained in answer to the former application will be made quite independently of me. The gentleman whose address alone is given in connection with that application is not a member of my congregation, and ministers of religion have been hitherto excluded from the Committee he represents. My address is, *The Rev. John Gordon, Chapel Hill, Dukinfield, Ashton-under-Lyne.*

Dukinfield, Oct. 17, 1862.

JOHN GORDON.

HACKNEY NONCONFORMITY.

SIR,

WHETHER or not the mode adopted by the Unitarian body to shew respect for the Two Thousand Ejected Ministers meets with general approbation, may perhaps be a question. The list of subscriptions to the Bicentenary Fund augments but slowly; and we are still a long way off from realizing the £30,000 which one of our friends, through your excellent associate in dispensing religious information, the *Inquirer*, hinted, whether in joke or earnest I don't know, as being possible; nor has the liberal offer of Mr. Colfox, a tried friend of our cause, a worthy scion of a worthy sire, made a few weeks since through that journal, had as yet any response. This question, however, I am not going to discuss. But from the extracts from sermons delivered on this occasion, so far as I have seen them, I am very apprehensive that the principle of Nonconformity is not so carefully or forcibly enforced on our young people as its importance demands. Indeed, while we find professed Unitarians sending their children to Trinitarian colleges and seminaries, we can hardly suppose that the principle of Nonconformity is much regarded, using the term Nonconformist to signify the *sole authority of Christ in his church*. And as a matter of curiosity, even if for no higher object, I should like to be informed—which, Mr. Editor, perhaps I can be by some of your correspondents—whether any book professedly explaining this subject forms part of the religious instruction of our family or other school-rooms, or is much noticed or referred to in our Sunday-schools; for if not, I question whether the pulpit effusions, however much from their composition they may have graced our chapels, will produce any extensive or lasting impression.

This I have long feared; but my thoughts have been more particularly directed to the matter by the review in the last *Reformer* of the sermon delivered lately by Mr. Kirkus, the present minister of the Independent chapel in Mare Street, Hackney; the reviewer commencing his remarks by rather a startling apostrophe to the village of Hackney itself, styling it "Hackney, Evangelical Hackney." Now, Sir, this is my native village; and though through many scenes I've passed

Since once in *Hackney's* shade

With peace and plenty hand in hand I stray'd,

I well remember the noble, dauntless spirits, sound, persevering friends of civil and religious liberty, who upwards of seventy years ago resided in that village, and among these were Drs. Price and Priestley, not to notice stars of minor brilliancy with which the pulpit of the Old Gravel-Pit meeting-house was successively graced; nor do I envy the mind of that person who can read Dr. Price's sermon on the Love of Country without being fired with enthusiasm in the cause of freedom.

From your notice in the *Reformer* of Mr. Kirkus's sermon, it seems that the congregation assembling at the Gravel-Pit was an offset from the one in Mare Street, and thus that the chapel at St. Thomas's Square, at this day respectably filled, is the original Nonconforming place of worship erected at Hackney, or at least that it stands near the original site; and I rejoice to think that amidst a great Babel or confusion of tongues both in and out of the national Establishment at the present day, all claiming to be evangelical, these pulpits are so respectably filled as

they now are, and that one is apparently, from his just published discourse, a fit successor of the Rev. Samuel Palmer, who seventy years ago was pastor of the Mare-Street chapel, and who remains intimately connected with the question of Nonconformity, for though dead he yet speaketh, and nobly speaketh on this point, as the editor in the year 1774 of Dr. Calamy's Nonconformist Memorial, and as the author of the Dissenting Catechism, which now I scarcely ever hear referred to.

I readily admit that to keep these works, with Towgood's Letters to White, prominently before the public, may unfortunately tend to cause a ripple on the breast of conforming cousins or of episcopal divines, and the feeling apparently prevalent in the present day in our body to avoid this may be very laudable if not carried too far; but it is so, when "Truth is silent because Folly frowns;" and however excellent may be many of the moral and religious tracts circulated by our societies—and I am very far from having any inclination to depreciate these—they seem to me to be in a Christian sense defective, if unaccompanied with the habitual practical recollection that our Lord enjoined on his disciples to call no man master upon earth in reference to religious creeds and observances. The spirit of the first injunction of our great Master was, "Attend to me;" and this was enforced by the celestial direction, "Hear ye him." And involved as were the Two Thousand in religious darkness, they at length obtained light sufficient to enable them to appreciate mental freedom; and the importance of the subject has urged me to trouble you, Mr. Editor, with my crude ideas; and if any apology be needful for occupying space in your useful publication, which properly perhaps belongs to younger and more able correspondents, it is that Hackney, with the recollection of those who more than seventy years ago there fanned the flame of religious liberty, when Birmingham had its politico-religious fires and Priestley was driven to America, gives warmth to my cold blood, and, raising me from a state of perfect senile apathy, renders me inclined to adopt Nelson's words to Collingwood, "I am not dead yet," and thus still able to wish success to your *Reformer*.

Chichester, Oct. 11, 1862.

JOHN FULLAGAR.

A LAY LOOK UPON '62.

SIR,

ERE the '62 of this century is closed, perhaps one of its aspects, as viewed by one of the laity, may not be out of season in the way of "Bicentenary" note and comment.

Laymen, in private liberal intercourse on such occasions, often have an ill-defined, half-conscious sense of interest in a valuable something to which they feel bound to lend their attention, give their money, and pay their theological respects. But a Bicentenary is regarded rather as a case for clergy than a case for laity. Is this well? Allusions to particular persons or performances, in any such matter as that to which I beg to advert, would not be inviting and might become invidious. Nor is any censorious imputation intended against either preachers or people amongst Unitarians and Free Christians and other liberals. Referring then in general terms to the ecclesiastical and spiritual uses of the Bicentenary, which have been well and truly heeded in pulpit and

in pew, I respectfully suggest that the glorious theme has not been made, I will not say "popular," but *laical* enough. It were surely wholesome that it be felt less clerical and technical, more fitted for "the people to hear gladly," and to rehearse *at home* as an impressive lesson for the hearth and heart even more than for the church and the intellect, touching *what is CÆSAR's, what is God's*. Let there not be even the shadow of a derogation from the official or personal dignity of the reverend brotherhood of which you are so well-known and worthy a member. Yet am I jealous for the rights and claims and duties of that much larger brotherhood named *laymen*; nor can I consent to ignore the other sex, especially in questions of morals and religion.

No stint of honour, now or at any time, to "the glorious Two Thousand." But—may I dare beseech the justice and mercy of clergy?—no monopoly of merit neither! Granting every safeguard to the proper claims and influence of clergy, we are ALL bound by faith and truth, even as servants of the same Lord, to beware of allowing any, how excellent soever of the earth, to be caressed as keepers of Christian consciences. To his own Master let every one, layman or clergyman, stand or fall; and let each sort cordially remind the other that "his own Master" is Jesus the Christ. In this memento is the very germ and life of conscientious Dissent, of reasonable Nonconformity. It is not that Dissent has in itself any merit or propriety; least of all if it be a mere cuckoo-cry when one set of birds has usurped or naturally availed itself of the occupancy of another's nest. The groundwork of all action taken must be discriminated, and by no means must be ascribed to an *order* of men, however good and true, but set forth as the necessary moral tenure of men, women and children competent to "witness a good confession." Regardless of some such steadfast precaution, of this or the like eternal *principle* of evangelical freedom, we are sure to find the liberty in Christ growing weak and small; and then—yea, even in the midst of liberal Protestant Nonconformity—the ever insidious disease of Popery infecting (not perhaps in name and in form, but in effect and in essence) the healthful organization and fine sensibilities of what were and should yet be free members of the spiritual body of Christ.

For every man of the 2000, I presume we may fairly reckon an average of 100 "good men and true," besides worthy women and obedient children, who flocked after the preacher and "sat under" his ministry. Without the conscientious, pious, attached *laity*, where and what would have been the clergyman? The welcome sentiment ("toast" it used to be in days of more drinking usage), "The glorious Two Thousand," I would strenuously reinforce by "one cheer more" for each of the two 0's. Yes, albeit male and female hearers be represented by but two *ciphers*, yet, placed as they should be on the right side, they make the 2000 worth one hundred times as much as the worthy preachers could have been without these superadded 0's.

Now I trust you will pardon a freeborn layman for uttering the perhaps unwelcome opinion that scant respect towards the *laical* element in liberal Protestantism is not among the lowest or darkest reasons why the Bicentenary commemoration has gone off unsatisfactorily. And who can for a moment dare speak, write or look as if '62 was going off as one had hoped?

Among the self-styled "Orthodox," who, whether men of dissent or

of assent and consent, subscribe more or less to articulated creeds and formularies of faith, a murmur of "Amen" from the laity, or from the laymen in the pews and seats, may serve the purposes of *their* pulpits. Parliaments, convocations, synods, or other juntas clerical, may win from submissive mouths a dependent concurrence in the *dicta* authorized by the cloth, the closet or the cloister. Even among such (let us thank God for this) there are now many well-called *independent* "Independents," both lay and cleric, who decline to say "Amen" to what is prayed or preached in phraseology which to them sounds as "an unknown tongue." But never yet has divinity by deputy sufficed (Heaven grant it never may suffice!) for *heterodox* Nonconformity. Genuine Dissent of this type respectfully but uncompromisingly merges clergy into laity and both into liberty, according to the gospel of God.

Can we well doubt that the moral force and social influence, both religious and political, "out of all proportion to their numbers," which a Quarterly reviewer has recently conceded to the possession of Unitarians, is attributable to that freeborn individuality of mental character which, not slightly respecting the like in others, will not brook even the shadow or the odour of spiritual thralldom? *Their* men, women and clergy are FREE. In a day such as this, when even the *Times*, in the course of an almost jocular article on Archbishops, can aver that a Primate, "so far from being able to establish any Article of Faith, is obliged to accept the interpretation of the Articles as given by a lay Judge," it is but timely and wise that Christians who are bishopless but not faithless beware of any assumption of interpretative official power. The very appearance of such priestcraft or creedcraft is to be religiously avoided, alike by clergy and by laity, amongst all who fondly echo those words of the holy Paul, "After the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers." Obviously it comports more than usual with the spirit of the age, in unison thus with the letter and the spirit of the gospel, that a temper and tendency be clerically shewn and laically recognized and cordially reciprocated, which, whatever be the "diversities of gifts," shall lend no countenance to that "Stand by, I am holier than thou," which manner speaks as loudly as matter.

Throughout ecclesiastical history there are weighty as well as numerous proofs that Christian life has been buoyant, biblical interpretation has been sound and clear, churches, congregations, communions, variously stamped with "the name of Christ," have got and kept spiritual force in the ratio of the *laical* energy within them. Come what will to popes, archbishops, priests, deacons, and all other clergy, let not the laity be lacking or losing in active zeal according to knowledge, or, let both church and world rely upon it, as Christianity's lesson, we shall be "ever learning and never coming to a knowledge of the truth." Some of the most stanch, stirring and stalwart *saints*, deserving well the name, in I know not how many churches, have been laymen, and when becoming "divines" have retained deep and large in their faithful hearts, even as did He of Nazareth, love for *lay* humanity. Cornelius the centurion, probably also Apollos the eloquent, with other early devotees to the divine doctrine of the New Testament, were but the prototypes of names out of number that have (as it were) culminated upon a long and high Christian series, in such laymen of light and love as Locke, Milton, and the like in this and other lands and other times.

Invariably, as is the freedom of opinion and inquiry, with the sacred sense of equal future accountability, found to prevail in a denomination, so is the line of demarcation between clergy and laity less sharply defined and less palpably definable, till all trace of it is lost in the Leader of all laymen, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Inversely, as is the supineness of the laity and the self-sufficiency of clergy, so is the line drawn black and broad between orders and classes, inquiry dull or dead, freedom forfeited, right and duty neglected, and Christ crucified afresh.

Were I competent to make it, my appeal would be, not unto clergymen to do less than they so well do among heretical Christians, but unto laymen and women to do more in the cause of free study, free thought, free speech, free work. Doubtless one influence which largely draws persons of liberal and genial spirit into the Church established by law is, that it leaves the laity so unmolested in matters of opinion, how strict or lax soever it may be upon the consciences of its own clergy. But heterodox Protestant Dissent is not to rest contented with a negative and inert freedom from control in such matters; it necessitates positive and active personal assertion of conscientious liberty for self and for society; it makes not its profession by proxy; neither does it subscribe to the *dicta* of any divines, be they as heretically heterodox as they may.

Now this manly, natural, wholesome condition of spiritual affairs will continue only just so long as lay Nonconformists bestir themselves to co-operate in head and heart with their clerical brethren—especially so amongst Unitarians.

At such a conjuncture as the present, it cannot be irrelevant to glance at those mutations in student life and collegiate intercourse which, inevitable as they are, yet must unavoidably lessen the youthful attachments of lay and divine. Nor can this influence stop short in youth; it must go on through adult years. May we not fairly question whether such college life as we enjoyed at York was not a most healthful agency for friendships, free from caste and full of common aims in liberal education, which is weak or void amongst us now?

Regretful as we may be for the past, it is thoroughly refreshing to hear that our Alma Mater numbers at present some few who, without entering as divines, like to make theologic lore and free religious culture more their own. This augurs well for layman and for clerk in heterodox churches; and, through them, in others also. From such a "nursery of men for future years" may spring perhaps many a Hopton Haynes, Edgar Taylor, Samuel Sharpe, and other accomplished lay student in the things of divinity.

But it is not simply for the sake of religious disenfranchisement, it is no less for just appreciation of *political* freedom, that the laity should make the principles of Christian *heresy* well understood. I use the term as expressive of just liberty and something more; not merely licence to choose, but free choice conscientiously made. And this, alike an obligation and a prerogative, is quite as much laical as clerical in the sight of God; or rather it but ill bears either epithet in the faith of Christ. As a Christian citizen, a Christian subject, I must make or take my choice, my "heresy," among freely conflicting opinions. Yet, again, as a Protestant Nonconformist I may often find myself dissenting from

others (whether Dissenters or Conformists) as to the ground and extent of heretical protest and separation.

And herein are no small nor cold thanks due to Nonconformist clergy, both heterodox and orthodox (though by no means to all alike), for dissipating, by their lucid and effective discourses, certain old fallacies regarding 1662. Perhaps yourself and other divines would be hard to believe how needed was and is the historical reminder that the 2000 were not all heterodox, and not all Nonconformists of the type of 1862; nay, that some were even, in religious principle, Conformists; the objections of their minds and hearts being not against subscription to articles of belief established by civil law, but to those especial articles framed in Charles's Act of Uniformity. Indubitably also there were many of the glorious confessors who based their dissent and non-subscription upon the broad principle of the gospel, that no human authority should be allowed to dictate in the matters of religious faith and worship incumbent upon disciples of Jesus Christ. And on this ground some would then, as yet more should now, refuse to subscribe assent and consent (though they *felt* these), purely because they would not let Cæsar claim to have rendered unto him the things which are always to be rendered unto God only. With every staunchest friend of religious freedom, it was not (and may it never be!) enough that they set not their seal, lent not their name, *to a lie*. No; their sense of right and truth went beyond this; yea, even although they held as God's truth all the creed or creeds to which they were bidden subscribe, yet would they not do so. And why? Because no secular power or state policy in Christendom is authorized or competent to lay burdens upon consciences, or dictate declarations of belief and homage towards Him who is Spirit and is to be worshiped (not only not falsely, but also not by signed words) in spirit as well as in truth. Always add to this, that He is to be so worshiped and believed not more by clergy than by laity, not less by women than by men. Never may the spiritual stock fail, in whose lists are found a Mrs. Barbauld, a Lady Hewley, a Joanna Baillie, a Miss Middleton, a Mrs. Humble, and others not a few, whose labours of love and mental accomplishments must ever win admiring gratitude, if not untiring imitation, from both sexes in all sects; while they stir up energetic emulation in men, both lay and clerical!

Be supreme civil power as it may at Rome and in Russia, yet in England it is constitutionally and essentially *laical*. Nor let our eyes be closed to the religious influences in faith and in practice at all times, and markedly at this time, emanating from England's highest. Like the earliest English Christian king, the present Sovereign would never, we may be sure, wish to command or coerce any conscience into assent, consent or dissent. Thus at least I "cast one longing, lingering look behind" on A.D. '62.

Highbury New Park, Oct. 5, 1862.

S. C. FREEMAN.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Edinburgh Review. No. 236.*The Quarterly Review.* No. 224.

WE may well admire the variety of topics discussed by the leading English periodicals, and the general excellence, literary and moral, by which they are characterized. However few and uninteresting the books published during the season (and the present season has been, we believe, alike unsatisfactory to the public and unprofitable to the trade), the Reviews continue to give essays on all conceivable subjects, many of them the produce of the wisdom or the wit of the best thinkers of the age. It may be matter of regret that so much power is expended on compositions which not often exceed a life of three months' duration. But the fact of such a continuous literary stream is certainly proof of the copious civilization of our times. The two most venerable of our Quarterlies, the *Edinburgh* and the *Quarterly*, have in their present issue some common topics. The American struggle forms in each periodical the closing article. Though different in structure, both articles agree in spirit, and reflect the common sentiment of Englishmen upon this unnatural and wicked war.

"War of any kind," says the *Quarterly*, "is only excusable when it is waged with a tolerable likelihood of success. A war for a reconstruction of the Union bore failure upon its face. * * * To compel the Southerners to return as willing citizens and take their part as of old in the political mechanism of the Republic, was an undertaking beyond the power of the highest genius and the mightiest armies. It was impossible for Englishmen to sympathize in a war which could have no end but desolation. And it was impossible for the keenest friend of the Federals not to mark how the war grew in horror as it progressed, and developed more and more the character of a mere war of revenge."—P. 537.

After alluding to the atrocities of Federal power at Athens, New Orleans, &c., the reviewer adds,—

"All these things fell lightly on the ears of the Federals themselves, but they have sunk deep into the hearts of Englishmen. We must have bidden farewell to every feeling both of humanity and honour before we can sympathize with a war of this kind, or with the men who wage it."—P. 537.

The reviewer mildly and cautiously pleads for European intervention to stop the horrors of the brutal war, and to give the Federals "an honourable plea for retreating from a contest from which they will assuredly never be extricated by success." The *Edinburgh* reviewer writes more dispassionately, but agrees in the opinion the restoration of the Union is now only possible under Jefferson Davis, not under Lincoln. He considers the proclamation by Lincoln of September 22 a blunder, aggravating political differences and not improving the prospects of abolition. In meeting the objection that Englishmen must not allow their sympathies in relation to the war to be influenced by their national interests, the reviewer pens these weighty sentences:

"We do not deny the obligations of national morality. We fully admit that every people is responsible for its acts, and for the way in which it exercises its influence over others. A violation of national faith, or a wanton provocation of the greatest of all evils—war—is never committed with impunity.

As it is, however, with private, so it is with public, morality; the providence of God has ordained, that the real prosperity of nations, as of individuals, and the good government of the civilised world, should be worked out by the action of each seeking, within certain limits, that which is for his own interest. When a nation oversteps those limits there is a Nemesis waiting patiently to avenge the crime—a Nemesis not the less sure because the retribution is not always undergone by the generation which committed the offence nor understood by those on whom it falls. What is the meaning of the instinct of patriotism and the love of one's own country, except that men, in dealing with other nations, should keep steadily in view the welfare of their own? On no other principle can a state maintain its place in the civilised world, and on no other principle do we assign honours and rewards to our statesmen and our soldiers. On no other principle, certainly, can the prolonged war of the North against the South be for a moment defended."—P. 593.

He comes to the conclusion that while no moral influence hinders the recognition of the Southern States by England, such a recognition would at the present moment "effect very little, and might cause to England evils greater than those which it would remove." He therefore endorses the policy of Lord Palmerston's Government in relation to the war as the best under the embarrassing circumstances of the case.

On one other subject the two Reviews have each their article, the great religious questions which have been opened by the Essays and Reviews' controversy. The *Edinburgh* writes very calmly on "the Supernatural." The reviewer considers that much of the difficulty on this subject has arisen from "obscure thought and confused language." He disapproves of the ordinary definition of miracle as that which is a violation of natural law. He thinks that a larger view of the subject may accept miracle as coming within the pale of providential law. The spirit of the article well appears in one of its closing paragraphs:

"Assuredly, whatever may be the difficulties of Christianity, *this* is not one of them,—that it calls on us to believe in any exception to the universal prevalence and power of Law. Its leading facts and doctrines are directly connected with this belief, and directly suggestive of it. The Divine mission of Christ on earth—does not this imply not only the use of means to an end, but some inscrutable necessity that certain means, and these only, should be employed in resisting and overcoming evil? What else is the import of so many passages of Scripture implying that certain conditions were required to bring the Saviour of Man into a given relation with the race He was sent to save? 'It behoved Him to make the Captain of our Salvation perfect through suffering.' 'It behoved Him in all things to be made like unto His brethren, *that He might be,*' &c.—with the reason added: '*for in that He himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted.*' Whatever *more* there may be in such passages, they all imply the universal reign of law in the moral and spiritual, as well as in the material world: that those laws had to be—beheld to be—obeyed; and that the results to be obtained are brought about by the adaptation of means to an end, or, as it were, by way of natural consequence from the instrumentality employed. This, however, is an idea which systematic theology is very apt to regard with intense suspicion, though, in fact, all theologies involve it, and build upon it. But then they are very apt to give explanations of that instrumentality which have no counterpart in the material or in the moral world. Perhaps it is not too much to say that the manifest decay which so many creeds and confessions are now suffering, arises mainly from the degree in which at least the popular expositions of them dissociate the doctrines of Christianity from the analogy and course of nature. There is no such severance in Scripture—no shyness of illustrating Divine things by reference to the 'natural.' On the contrary,

we are perpetually reminded that the laws of the spiritual world are in the highest sense laws of nature, whose obligation, operation, and effect are all in the constitution and course of things."—Pp. 396, 397.

The article in the *Quarterly* is penned in the narrow and alarmist spirit of that against Essays and Reviews which appeared in the *Quarterly* in January, 1861. The reviewer takes to himself the credit of "waking up the slumbering garrison to the coming assault." Is, then, the Church, of which the reviewer makes some boasting statements, only "a slumbering garrison"? But, if we remember aright, a somewhat different history might be written of the genesis of the Essays and Reviews' controversy, and it was rather the pointed sarcasm of the *Westminster Review* than the coarse and dull invective of the *Quarterly* that roused public attention. The reviewer, writing as a sturdy Churchman, affects a jubilant tone on the position of the Church in relation to the heretical men who have disturbed the peace of Israel. He is comforted by the unanimous condemnation of their heresy by the Bench of Bishops, by the 10,000 clergymen who addressed a memorial to the late Archbishop of Canterbury; but especially is he comforted, at least so he professes, by the judgment of the Dean of Arches. He thinks it impossible that Rowland Williams and Mr. Wilson can be allowed to hold their office of teachers in the Church without full retraction. We have the uncomfortable fear that they are disposed to retain their place in the Church, and that they will succeed in doing it without making any such retraction as would satisfy Churchmen of the spirit of the *Quarterly* reviewer.

"We do not affect," says he, "not to rejoice in this decision. There were those who doubted the wisdom of bringing these men to trial; we were never of the number. The mischief—we must repeat it—which their writings could do depended, in our judgment, neither on their ability, for it was little; nor their power, for it was faint; nor their learning, for it was shallow and pretentious; nor on their novelty, for it was stale;—but upon their position. The evil of the case was not that vain men should vent their vanity, but that clergymen of the United Church should be the permitted teachers of scepticism. The censure of authority alone could redress this evil, and by authority they have been censured. The uneasy feeling, widely prevalent and working mighty harm, which arose from the belief that our Church could censure no error, has been set at rest. The concurrent cases of *Burder v. Heath*, which, to his high honour, the Bishop of Winchester carried through the Court of Appeal, regardless, in his zeal for the truth of God, alike of expense and obloquy, and the two Essay cases which have followed in the Court of Arches, have distinctly established the disputed fact that our Church not only possesses a Canon of Truth to defend, but has the means of defending it practically within her power."—Pp. 493, 494.

The reviewer admits that some good Churchmen were startled by some of the principles laid down by the Dean of Arches; but he submits that they were "essentially sound, and such as alone could, in a Church connected with the nation and the State, combine the needful safeguards at once of truth and liberty." These are strange words to use in connection with the Church of England and Dr. Lushington's judgment. To talk of *truth*, when the Judge laid it down as a first principle of his judgment that the Court had nothing to do with the truth or falsehood of the articles impugned, but simply with their agreement with or divergence from the articles and symbols of the Church of England! To talk of *liberty* when speaking of a Church whose theory and practice are

to deny to its clergy the right of teaching a doctrine which impugns the established creed, however clearly established by the progress of discovery, and to compel them to continue to utter error exploded by some unmistakeable truth! Such talk reminds one of the liberty of which President Lincoln is now the guardian, and the love of truth which influenced the holy men who forced Galileo to repudiate his great scientific discovery! But, happy as the reviewer is in the present humiliation of his foes in the Court of Arches, he evidently thinks his Church yet needs new and advanced bulwarks against latitudinarian error, and he does not doubt that if the "existing formularies prove to be an insufficient barrier against the fretting scepticism which has sought to rear its head amongst a few of our 20,000 clergy, the honest and faithful indignation which has already so signally condemned these latest attempts of unbelief would, if need be, embody itself in Articles of Religion sufficiently clear to enable our Judges legally to condemn the new devices of the old enemy of the faith." The reviewer also congratulates himself that the Legislature has not deprived the Synods of the Church of England of the right to condemn heresy. There is a touch of candour and right feeling in the admission that "the Church has probably no right, and therefore no requirement, to proceed against the person of the offender." An heretical clergyman may be driven out of home and society, impoverished and starved, but he must not be flogged or thrown into prison! So long as fiery spirits like the Bishop of Exeter (not to mention his brother of Oxford) exist and influence the temper and opinions of many of the clergy, it is well that the Legislature has limited the penal jurisdiction of Church Synods. In his jubilation, the reviewer congratulates Churchmen on "the literary issues of the conflict, in the exposure it has made of the shallow, crude, half-learned ignorance of the masters of the new movement, and in the enduring additions to our standard theology of which it has been the cause." The literary world scarcely looks on the matter in this light. It is, we suppose, matter of general wonder that so little has been written on the great themes treated in Essays and Reviews that is worth present reading, or has a fair chance of having a place in the theological literature of England. That among the 10,000 clergymen who have denounced the heretical volume, not more than three or four have succeeded in producing a reply about which the reading public cares a straw, is a fact that must greatly perplex those simple-minded men and "orthodox" old ladies who believe with our reviewer that Dr. Temple and his coadjutors in Essays and Reviews are sciolists and charlatans whose heresy lacks even the poor recommendation of novelty!

Another article of considerable interest in the *Quarterly* relates to the Taiping rebellion in China. A long passage explanatory of the religion of this people we must reserve for use on another occasion.

The other articles in the *Edinburgh* are, on Solar Chemistry, a new branch of science, which by an original method of analysis has already made some very important discoveries, and promises greatly to extend our knowledge not only of the great central luminary, but of the fixed stars also; on the Herculean Papyri; on the Mussulmans in Sicily; on the English in the Eastern Seas; on the Legend of St. Swithun; on Edward Irving's Life; on the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus; on Hops; and on Prince Eugene of Savoy. The popular English legend of St. Swithun's, of forty days of torrents of rain, must, it appears, be aban-

done. The disinterment and translation of the Saint was on a fair summer's day; at least there is no record to the contrary. When the translation was effected, the Saint shewed his gratification by lavishing unnumbered blessings on his worshippers.

"They who were healed were counted not by tens or hundreds, but by thousands. The sick and diseased crowded the churchyard, so that it was hard to pass through them to the minster; within a few days not five remained infirm. The walls of the Church were loaded with the tokens of the saint's holiness and power. Crutches and cripples' stools were conclusive evidence of the truth that 'Christ is Almighty God, who his saint demonstrated through such benefits.' The means may appear strange, but they were intended to enforce a lesson which cannot be questioned,—the duty, namely, of earning God's kingdom with good works, 'just as Swithun did who now shineth through wonders.'"—P. 425.

The reviewer of Mrs. Oliphant's *Life of Irving*, while doing ample justice to his intellect and moral nature, observes, "What a ruin the dark unhealthiness of millenarian superstition has made of this man!"

OBITUARY.

Sept. 21, SARAH, relict of the late Stephen HUMBLE, Esq., of Quarry Cottage, Idle, Yorkshire.

Mrs. Humble had long been resident at Idle, and with the late Mr. Humble for many years attended the services of Chapel-Lane chapel, Bradford, distant about three miles. For although the old Presbyterian chapel, of which the late Joseph Dawson, Esq., of Royds Hall, had once been minister, was still standing at Idle, it had passed into the hands of the Independents during the ministry of his successor, Mr. Vint.

On the death of Mr. Humble in 1849, it seemed probable that Mrs. Humble might change her residence. She was, however, providing some compensations for the event. Some missionary efforts from Leeds and Bradford had already commenced at Stanningley and Pudsey; Mr. Richard Varley, of Stanningley, a member of the Wesleyan body, having embraced Unitarian views, and an active spirit of inquiry having sprung up at Pudsey under the impulse of Joseph Barker's change, and especially fostered by his reprint of Dr. Channing's works. A few working men and others at Idle shared this spirit;* and on its becoming known to Mrs. Humble, just as on her impending removal she was preparing to grant some cottage property for the use of the Temperance Society which she had

always aided, she chose rather to devote it to the new religious purpose, which she well knew would otherwise be friendless, while the Temperance interest would not. Accordingly the modest room was opened for Unitarian worship, June 10, 1849, and took its place with Stanningley and Pudsey as a mission station. They were then supplied by an arrangement entered into with the Leeds Domestic Mission, as well as by the voluntary services of a few friends from Bradford and Leeds. In October of the same year, Mrs. Humble removed to Liverpool, but continued to manifest unabated interest in what she had left behind. The next year she subscribed £25 to the West-Riding Mission, then formally set on foot; and in 1851, in consideration of its first missionary, Rev. Edmund Squire, residing at Idle, she subscribed £50. This was not all. By the end of the year she engaged Mr. Squire as sole minister for Idle at her own expense, and for two or three years subscribed £20 a-year to the Mission besides. In 1852, Idle was again included in its operations, during a temporary absence of Mr. Squire. In the spring of 1853, Mrs. Humble herself returned. This was more than all. Mr. Squire had resumed his ministry there, and it was now that she fitted up with everything requisite for a chapel and school, the two large rooms in the building adjacent to her own residence, which accordingly took the place of the cottage property a little further off, hitherto used for the purpose. The new rooms were opened January 1, 1854. On Mr. Squire's final

* That there had formerly been Presbyterian chapels both at Pudsey and Idle, in some measure accounts for the success of the Unitarian movement in both places.

departure for America a few months after, the Rev. Alexander M'Combe was engaged by Mrs. Humble as his successor. Towards the beginning of 1857, the idea of a proper chapel was entertained. Other denominations in Idle had then recently built or rebuilt chapels and school-houses; amongst others, the Independents had re-edified the old Presbyterian meeting-house, into possession of which they had long before come. Mrs. Humble acceded to the wishes of the people; and, aided by her excellent friends, the Miss Dawsons, of Royds Hall, who possessed considerable property in the neighbourhood, the design was made known, and met with ready help from a larger circle. Not without some discouragement on the spot, the building was at length completed, and opened June 13th, 1858. It stands on a considerable plot of rising ground,* the gift of the late Miss Dawson; but which, from its close vicinity to one end of the village, cannot be used for interments. It commands, as do most sites in the neighbourhood, a very ample view of Airedale; and on its lower corner, nearest the village, has since arisen a very similar structure, comprising a most becoming school-house and chapel-keeper's residence. Perhaps those who are unacquainted with this part of the country should be told, that every house and cottage and mill, much more chapels and churches, are of stone, with which every hill and field abounds. In this undertaking Mrs. Humble was assisted by one or two of the same friends as before, although it was accomplished very mainly at her own cost. It was finished and opened in the after part of 1861. Its interior has a most bright and cheerful aspect, and, as its predecessor, adjoining Mrs. Humble's residence, had been, is hung round with a beautiful set of coloured scripture and other prints. Its excellent adaptation for a day-school will, it is hoped, some time fulfil the whole of its founder's desire.

The free grants and erection of the outward school and church, considerable as they were, formed but a part, and perhaps not the greatest part, of Mrs. Humble's efforts. We have seen what her subscriptions for their maintenance were. She continued to subscribe handsomely to the West-Riding Mission after her higher subscriptions ceased, notwithstanding that the maintenance of Idle alone, with its separate ministers, from 1851 to the present year, the slight interval of 1852 excepted, was at her sole cost; not only a handsome salary, but her house and table, during the whole

of that period, with some little exception, having been theirs also. Moreover, she had completed her good work long before her death by a most considerate and munificent provision for the event—the gift, viz., of her house with all its furniture just as it was in her lifetime, “only that she might live in it till she died;” together with the adjoining premises and pleasant garden, perhaps of all the spots in the vicinity commanding the richest and widest view—the whole sweep of the wooded vale, with the viaducts of the Leeds and Bradford Railway, the new Rawdon College, villas and villages, interspersed. She has provided also for a year's salary subsequently to her death. The deed of gift declares that it is a memorial of her late husband; and though here we approach the limits which a notice like this must observe, yet we cannot but remark that as the efforts which have now claimed a record began in consequence and in memory of his death, so also they conclude. “His loss would otherwise have been twice felt.” Such without doubt was Mrs. Humble's self-devoted, self-forgetting thought. Those who knew her best will testify to the truth of this her leading characteristic. It is not our object to say more. Other notices have appeared of her character and worth.* The same self-forgetfulness, almost to the not calling what she had her own, appeared in every relation. It may hence be imagined, as it is now most deeply felt, what she was in her household, to a large circle of attached friends, to the numerous poor and others around her in any need or sorrow. Very many of all these have yet to learn their loss. Yet we may be sure that in the appointed time “it is expedient for us that such friends go away.” It is ours to improve alike their presence and departure.

For the last few years Mrs. Humble had experienced symptoms of a painful affection of the chest, and latterly had suffered severe attacks, most apprehensively reminding her friends of Dr. Arnold's last illness. On the evening of Tuesday, Sept. 9th, she was seized with one of these, after having perhaps been better than usual, and, with even more than her ordinary self-devotion, having the same day made a distant call. From this attack she never rallied, notwithstanding the most assiduous attentions of relatives and friends; but, after much suffering for nearly a fortnight, died peacefully on Sunday evening, Sept. 21st. She was interred on the following Thursday in the family vault at Calverley, in the parish of which Idle

* The building has been registered as Highfield chapel.

* *Inquirer*, Sept. 27; *Unitarian Herald*, Oct. 4.

is a township. The beautifully situated churchyard looks down on another part of the rich vale which she and her husband daily looked upon, and to so many of the inhabitants of which, their sequestered but active lives had been a daily blessing. On the following Sunday, sermons were preached in the chapel she had founded; the one in the morning by Rev. J. H. Ryland, from 2 Cor. i. 12, "For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward;" that in the afternoon by Rev. A. McCombe, from Luke viii. 52, "She is not dead, but sleepeth;" at the conclusion of which he paid a most just and affecting tribute to Mrs. Humble's memory.

Sept. 26, MARGARET, the wife of Robt. Taylor HEAPE, of Roach Bank, Rochdale, aged 45 years. She was the daughter of the late Edmund Grundy, of Park Hills, Bury, and inherited no small share of the strength of character and firmness of principle which were conspicuous in her father. Like every true woman, she found her best sphere of activity, while health continued, at home, as a wife and mother; and by her sons just entering manhood the loss of her affectionate influence must be most severely felt: but they cherish her memory so fondly that to them, though dead, she yet speaketh. To dwell at any length on what she was would be inconsistent with her simplicity of character and with her own expressed desire. But it is important to place on record the support and comfort which she found, amid much suffering, in the faith we profess, to which she was sincerely attached from personal conviction, and which she valued more and more the longer she experienced its influence.

During the last three years of her life, Mrs. Heape was visited by chronic disease, which produced extreme emaciation and weakness, with at times much nervous prostration. It would not have been surprising if her mental powers had entirely given way under such a severe and protracted visitation. But hers was one of those cases which beautifully illustrate the supremacy of the mind over the body and its innate consciousness of immortality. As her physical nature grew weaker, her spiritual nature came out in bolder relief, and asserted itself in more emphatic expression. As the outer perished, the inner was renewed from day to day. The beautiful teachings of her Unitarian faith re-

ceived by her implicitly supported her in this trying season, and she looked on God as her Father and heaven as her home with humble and grateful confidence, frequently expressing to her husband and family the comfort she derived from her religion and the perfect trust she had in God's mercy. She was not given to much speaking, and when she did speak one might be sure that it was sincerely meant and a real utterance. Thus would she dwell on any seasonable word uttered by a friend, and repeat it to her family and speak of the comfort it gave her. The idea presented might be a common one, but her faith gave it a value greater perhaps than it had for the utterer. Thus the ideas of impressions on the passive and waiting mind from heavenly sources, of the impenetrability of the soul by physical suffering and death, of the retreat inwards from outward sources of annoyance, and of bending herself to carry out God's merciful providence in her approaching change, dwelt in her mind, and this faith nourished her spiritual being. As the end drew near, she grew even more gentle and patient, though she had ever been both, and her affectionate nature seemed to have freer expression. She would often greet a friend with a smile, and by a little pleasantry throw a grace over her troubles. She looked so calmly indeed on her approaching departure as to be able to give directions about her funeral, which she wished to be of the simplest character. On the morning previous to her departure, when the coming event had already cast its shadow before, she fully endorsed the following lines, repeated in her presence:

Ah, no! my soul would meekly wend
her gentle way
To the cool shades of peace and God's
sweet rest;

and afterwards repeated them as far as she could.

The last scene was worthy of what had gone before. Ten minutes before she left this sphere, she asked her medical attendant, who had just before entered her room, "Doctor, am I going?" "Yes, Mrs. Heape, you are," was the answer, for she was worthy to hear the truth, and worthily did she respond, "Thank God!" in the last words she uttered here. Meekly she closed her eyes, never more consciously to open them in this phase of life.

Quietly she passed away as one who had fallen asleep. Glory be to God who giveth strength and grace and blessing! and may we all have like faith and openness of heart to receive his mercy in our extremity!